

A
'69
A1213

THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE MINISTER
AS SEEN IN THE CONFLICT
BETWEEN THE CONFRONTING AND SUSTAINING ASPECTS
OF HIS PREACHING AND PASTORAL ROLES

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the
School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Religion

by
Harry W. Adams
June 1969

REPRODUCED COPY
OF
THE
ORIGINAL

This dissertation, written by

Harry Wakefield Adams

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

Howard J. Chittell, Jr.

Loren R. Fisher

R. Morgan Edwards

Date

June 1969

F. Murray Twiss
Dean

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (November)	97
II. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (December)	98
III. Sermon 2 Questionnaire	115
IV. Sermon 4 Questionnaire	122

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
II. THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORITY OF	
THE MINISTER	7
A. Authority as Leadership	8
B. Some Limitations of Preaching	13
1. Communications Revolution	14
2. Social and Personal Change	15
3. Response Problems	16
4. Preacher Stereotype	16
C. Conflicts Between Preaching and	
Pastoral Counseling	18
D. Definition of Terms	21
1. Preaching	21
2. Prophetic	23
3. Pastoral Counseling	26
4. Pastoral Preaching	29
E. Affinities Between Preaching and	
Pastoral Counseling	31
1. Preaching as Counseling	32
2. Counseling as Proclamation	34
F. Directions in Which a Solution	
May Lie	36

	iii
Chapter	Page
III. WILLIAM GLASSER'S REALITY THERAPY AS A	
MODEL OF A POSSIBLE SOLUTION	42
A. Definition of Terms	44
1. Reality	44
2. Responsibility	45
3. Right and Wrong	46
B. An Outline of Glasser's Approach	47
1. Recognition of Man's Basic	
Human Needs	48
2. Involvement With Others	50
3. Confrontation About Behavior	54
4. Help in Satisfying Needs	61
C. Dangers and Strengths	65
1. Dangers	65
2. Strengths	68
D. Applications to the Problem of the	
Minister's Authority	71
1. Involvement as Grace	73
2. Confrontation as Judgment and	
Works	74
E. Summary	76
IV. APPLICATIONS TO ONE PARISH	77
A. The Three Groups	77
1. Group I	78

Chapter	Page
2. Group II	79
3. Group III	80
B. The Sermon Series	81
C. The Testing Instruments	84
1. Leader Behavior Description	
Questionnaire	84
2. Feeling and Idea Communication	
Questionnaire	89
3. Feedback Response Measurement	94
V. RESEARCH RESULTS	96
A. Leader Behavior Description	
Questionnaire	96
1. Exploring the Results	100
2. Conclusions	108
B. Feeling and Idea Communication	
Questionnaire	110
1. Sermon 2	113
2. Sermon 4	119
3. Conclusions	126
C. Feedback Response Measurement	126
VI. CONCLUSION	130
A. General Conclusions	130
B. Implications for Preaching	132
C. Implications for Counseling	136

Chapter	Page
D. Implications for Small Groups	138
E. Dangers	141
F. Suggestions for Further Study	143
G. Conclusion	144
BIBLIOGRAPHY	146
APPENDICES	150
A. (Cover Letter)	151
B. Member Opinionaire on Social Problems . .	152
C. Report to Congregation	154
D. Leader Behavior Description	
Questionnaire	156
E. LBDQ Record Sheet	163
F. Feeling and Idea Communication	
Questionnaire	164
G. Sermon 1 (November 12)	166
H. Sermon 3 (November 26)	170
I. Sermon 1: Conquering Loneliness	174
J. Sermon 2: Having Authority Worthy	
of Respect	185
K. Sermon 3: Bringing Good Out of Evil . .	197
L. Sermon 4: A Pastor Ponders Vietnam . . .	207

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Ministers have always faced problems centering around their authority. Authority has been defined as the power to influence the thought, opinions, and outward behavior of others¹--in short, the power to lead. This dissertation focuses on one problem of the authority of the minister as leader, namely how he can proclaim what he believes to be the truth in the light of the gospel, however confronting it may be, without alienating his congregation. Some parishioners find it difficult to feel positive regard for the leadership of the minister who presents the gospel with fidelity to its inherent confrontation. There could be many causes, not the least of which may be the personality difficulties of the preacher. However, preaching is not always confronting. Much that comes from pulpits today is strongly pastoral, even what has been called "repressively inspirational."²

One part of the difficulty is that there is an element of confrontation in the gospel itself that can inhibit one's feeling close to the man who delivers this

¹Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1966), p. 146.

²Edgar Jackson, A Psychology for Preaching (Great Neck: Channel Press, 1961), p. 49.

message and discourage respect for his leadership. How, then, does the preacher who dares speak the gospel with loyalty to its confrontational aspects do so without losing the trust of those who listen and their acceptance of his leadership. There is always the possibility he cannot. This dissertation is concerned with what can be done to minimize the risk and facilitate the positive possibilities.

The problem seems to be basically one of conflict between the confronting and sustaining aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. Much of a minister's work is to sustain and support. However there are times when confrontation is called for in counseling and preaching as well as in other aspects of the ministry, and it is at these points that conflict arises. This conflict is due in part to the fact that confrontation is usually harder to accept than support. Also there is the general misunderstanding that a minister's main task is to sustain, and that confrontation is a departure from his basic task. Therefore any solution to this conflict must of course reconcile the sustaining and confronting aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles.

William Glasser's Reality Therapy³ will be used as a possible model for the reconciliation of these two. It is Glasser's thesis that, for our basic human needs to love and be loved and to feel worthwhile to be met, there must be caring involvement with each other. In such an atmosphere there can be confrontation about behavior and attitudes that restrict the fulfillment of basic needs. When this happens, persons can work together in helping each other find socially constructive and personally satisfying ways of loving and being loved and feeling worthwhile. This is also certainly a goal of Christian community.

If what Glasser says has validity, then there is a strong implication for the problem of the authority of the minister. It will be the purpose of this dissertation to explore whether the key to the reconciliation of the confronting and sustaining aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles lies in the quality of the relationship between the minister and his congregation before, during, and after confrontation. If it is a relationship of close involvement that includes trust and genuine concern for each other, then the sermon will be prepared and delivered, heard and evaluated, in a way that makes the

³William Glasser, Reality Therapy (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

relationship stronger because of the honest exchange involved. The minister will present the gospel with its indigenous confrontation without decreasing their respect for his leadership.

The thesis of this dissertation is that the closer the relationship between the preacher and his parishioners in terms of openness, trust, and concern for each other, the greater the chance that confrontation through the sermon will not cause rejection of the preacher's leadership. There will be increased acceptance of his leadership.

The thesis was tested by a series of four sermons, two of a confrontational nature, alternating with two containing considerably less confrontational material. The purpose was to measure the impact of the confronting sermons on three different groups who were in varying degrees of relationship with the minister. The two confronting-type sermons were selected from a list of subjects on current social concerns presented in questionnaire form to two Sunday morning congregations. The two concerns receiving the highest rating were chosen for sermon topics.

The research design includes the use of two questionnaire-type testing devices designed to measure the feelings of the members of the three different groups toward the preacher-pastor. The first test is the Leader

Behavior Description Questionnaire⁴ developed by the graduate Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University and widely used in the measurement of the attitudes toward the behavior of leaders, including ministers. This questionnaire was administered, once before the four sermons were preached, and once afterward, to see if the confrontational sermons effected any measurable change. The second testing device is a brief Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire (19 multiple choice questions).⁵ It was adapted from a questionnaire developed by James T. Hall⁶ and was administered to all the persons in the research project immediately after hearing each of the four sermons. Eleven questions ask for reactions about feelings and eight about ideas and content.

These two devices were used with the three groups of "reactors"⁷ from the congregation mentioned above. The first group was made up of leading laymen and their spouses in their forties and early fifties with whom the

⁴See Chapter V.

⁵See Chapter V.

⁶James T. Hall, "Measuring the Communication of Feeling During Worship," Pastoral Psychology, XIV:137 (October 1963), 50-58.

⁷"Reactor" is one who agrees to participate in the research by reacting to the sermons in the research project.

author has been working closely in a "dialogue group"⁸ for over a year. The second group consisted of couples in their late twenties and early thirties in a "dialogue group" with whom he has also been closely involved. The third group were volunteers from a random sampling of persons of various ages from among the active members of the congregation.

If the thesis is valid, the tabulation of the results should show two things. First, it should show that closeness of relationship is associated with more favorable descriptions of the minister's behavior as leader. Second, it should show that the favorable rating increases as a function of confrontation. That is, that ratings by people who are close to the leader will improve more as a function of confrontation than ratings by people who are less close to the leader.

Thus the authority of the minister, based upon his acceptance as a leader, would be a function of the quality and degree of involvement he has with his people. If this relationship is close enough, he may be able to proclaim the gospel with all of its inherent confrontation without losing their respect for his leadership.

⁸"Dialogue Group" is the name for several small discussion groups in the author's church.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE MINISTER

Edmund Holt Linn clearly describes the modern minister's situation as one authority among many competing for man's attention:

There was a day when the parson was one of the few educated persons in the community, but the revolution of the twentieth century has changed that circumstance. Sprinkled through the preacher's congregation many be those who are on the frontiers of business, technology, and research. Ever greater proportions of people have completed college and graduate school courses. More than ever before, college professors, nuclear scientists, astronomers, mathematicians, medical and drug researcher, electronics engineers, computer designers, space technicians, and social scientists are present in the congregation. The cosmos in which life exists is infinitely beyond man's imagination. Its laws, processes, and uniformity make the old discrimination between natural and supernatural incredible.

If religion seems to such people to have a valid place in this cosmos . . . it must be rational and intelligible. Such individuals, trained to think soundly about their callings, have the insight to weigh the preacher's point of view in relation to the pressures which a technological society brings upon them, and are able to decide whether or not he offers them a reasonable faith.¹

Is it any wonder that the preacher has begun to feel insecure, as far as the authority of his leadership is concerned?

¹Edmund Holt Linn, Preaching as Counseling (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1966), p. 13.

This chapter is concerned with examining the problem of the authority of the minister as seen in the conflicts between confronting and comforting aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. First a definition of authority will be presented, and the sources of this authority will be examined. Second, some limitations of preaching will be outlined, because part of the minister's authority problem arises from his preaching role. Third, the general area of conflict between preaching and counseling will be sketched. Fourth, some definitions will be made which should help clarify what is meant by such terms as preaching, prophetic, pastoral counseling, and pastoral preaching. Fifth, the affinities between preaching and counseling will be highlighted. And sixth, the directions in which a resolution of the conflict between confronting and comforting may lie will be presented.

A. AUTHORITY AS LEADERSHIP

In discussing the minister's authority problem, a definition of authority in this context is necessary. Authority was defined earlier as the power to lead. For the purpose of this dissertation the minister's authority will be defined as his power or ability to give leadership. This power arises from several sources.

First of all there is the authority of the minister's office. He is ordained by the church, and is

thereby given authority to preach and administer the sacraments as well as to lead in all the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church. He commands a certain authority just because the church has seen fit to vest this authority in him. It is assumed that he would not have been ordained in the first place if he were not the kind of person worthy of this trust and leadership. However the important thing to keep in mind is that this authority is conferred by the church through ordination and is therefore official rather than personal.

A second kind of ministerial authority is charismatic. Charisma is defined as "that special spiritual power or personal quality over large numbers of people."² All great religious leaders have this quality of leadership. In fact many ministers have it to some degree. However it is not a prerequisite of the minister's office. The Roman Catholic Church, out of its vast experience, has recognized that the priest's authority cannot be based solely on charisma. For if the administration of the sacraments depended on charismatic qualities in the priest, most priests would be incapable of functioning. Therefore the Church of Rome has declared that, "The efficacy of the Sacraments does not depend on the one who administers

²Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged (New York: Random House, 1966).

them"³ In general the Protestant Churches have placed more emphasis on the personal qualities of the minister, particularly his ability to preach effectively and relate well to people. So charisma, even though it be limited, is one aspect of the minister's authority in the Protestant churches.

A third aspect of the minister's authority is knowledge. His claim is to special knowledge. Thomas Oden suggests that it is grounded in the Biblical faith:

Could it be that the authority of the minister as prophet and pastor lies in the kerygma as God's self-disclosure, which we are called to proclaim and practice as men under the authority of God? This word of God we have, not from our own authority and reasoning but from the word of God that comes as a surprise and contradiction to all our expectations in Jesus Christ.⁴

Anyone familiar with Oden's theological stance will recognize that he follows closely the trail hewn out by Barth. Barth places a heavy reliance on the authority of scripture, and in general disparages all natural theology as being in any way finally authoritative. In following Barth, Oden seems to pit Christian revelation, in and through the scriptures, against other competing authorities such as science and technology and the humanities.

³Bertrand L. Conway, The Question Box (New York: Paulist Press, 1929), p. 232.

⁴Thomas C. Oden, Kerygma and Counseling (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 128.

But what is the preacher's actual position vis a vis the world, as far as his authority is concerned? Whether he follows Barth and Oden or makes a more modest claim of authority he is still in a difficult position, because the world sees him as just one more authority among many. Beyond this he often feels without any certainty as to just where he fits in, because the world usually does not recognize his claim to any special authority. He then becomes a competitor with other disciplines, whether he likes it or not, and with no built-in factors in his favor. A retreat into a Biblical authoritarianism, however erudite and enlightened, is no answer. The universality of knowledge has cut off this route, and the preacher must find his authority within the greater context of all thought, which of course includes pure science and social science and all technologies they spawn, not to mention the humanities. It would seem that the biblical faith, enlightened by as much of the full spectrum of all human knowledge as the minister can grasp, is his special authority in a world of competing authorities.

The fourth aspect of the minister's authority is pastoral. This is the authority of a trusting relationship between minister and congregation that grows from experience of each other. When a minister relates to his people as one who really cares about them and their needs, even to the point of risking himself with them by sharing

his own honest reactions and beliefs, they come to trust him as one who will not lead them astray. When this happens, the minister's leadership takes on a pastoral authority. And this kind of authority is compatible with the three previously mentioned aspects of ministerial authority--the official, the charismatic, as well as special knowledge. In fact, the authority of pastoral involvement is the one essential ingredient in ministerial authority. Without it the authority of the ordained office is coldly official rather than warmly personal. Without it charismatic authority can break down when confronted by the need for close personal relationships. Without it, the authority of special knowledge can be stillborn because it cannot be communicated by the contagion of life touching life in personal involvement.

If the thesis of this dissertation is correct, then the problem of the authority of the minister focuses on the relationship between the minister and his congregation. Where that relationship is close in terms of openness, trust, and concern for each other, the greater will be the authority of the minister because the congregation will be more open to his leadership. For it will enhance his official authority given by ordination, it will broaden any charismatic qualities he may have, and it will help communicate the special knowledge of the gospel.

B. SOME LIMITATIONS OF PREACHING

Part of the problem of the minister's authority focuses on preaching. And preaching has fallen on hard days. With at least 200,000 sermons delivered every Sunday in America, why is the effect on personal and social living not greater? That is the gist of much of the current criticism of preaching.

It would only be fair to say that preaching has some value. Certainly many persons are influenced and helped by it. Because the spoken word still has power to influence and change ideas and attitudes. No less an authority than Marshall McLuhan has pointed out that people are again getting information by hearing it over the telephone, the radio, and increasingly via television (which McLuhan considers an aural rather than a visual medium). He points out that, even apart from news media, more and more of today's communication is verbal in the traditional face-to-face sense.⁵ If McLuhan is right, then one might expect preaching could come into its own once again.

Yet there is much concern about preaching. In general it seems to have lost much of its authority. This is

⁵Charles E. Silberman, "Is Technology Taking Over?" Fortune, LXXIII:2 (February 1966), 220.

partly because preaching per se has some serious limitations as a means of communication which affect its authoritativeness. We are living in an age of revolution in the field of communication.

1. Communications Revolution

One of the most penetrating analyses of communication in the church has been done by Clyde H. Reid. After surveying the rapid growth in our understanding of communication, he concludes that the church makes a big mistake when it relies on preaching solely to communicate its message:

One of the aims of Christian communication is the meeting of mind with mind, the encounter of heart with heart and self with self--a dialogical relationship. Preaching rarely, if ever, achieves this end. One man is set apart, placed in an exalted position in the pulpit, and expected to establish a dialogical relationship with a mass of people. Our understanding of the nature of communication now helps us realize how futile this effort is when preaching is relied upon solely. Preaching as an isolated event in itself is an insufficient vehicle for the communication of the gospel. That preaching has an important place in the life of the church cannot be denied. It should be seen, however, not as an isolated event but as one element in a communications context which includes personal contacts and small group relationships.⁶

⁶Clyde Henderson Reid, "Two-Way Communication Through Small Groups In Relation to Preaching," (Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1960), p. 140.

Needless to say the church, particularly the Protestant branch, has leaned heavily on preaching, which in turn has contributed to the authority problem of the minister.

2. Social and Personal Change

Another serious limitation is the apparent serious weakness of preaching in effecting social and personal change. Reid again makes the indictment:

In spite of the emphasis on brotherhood in Protestant preaching in the North, the Church itself remains one of the most highly segregated institutions in America and Protestant Christians are among those who help maintain segregated neighborhoods. While preaching has probably had some influence in the direction of breaking down racial barriers, progress has been disappointingly slow.⁷

It would also be easy to cite the general ineffectiveness of preaching in communicating such personal beliefs as the central Christian affirmation about eternal life. Reid cites a survey of Harvard undergraduates that indicated only 31% of the Protestant students believed in the "continued existence of the individual soul as a surviving entity after the end of organic life."⁸ These apparent failures of the church to communicate its beliefs and ideals more adequately points to one serious consequence of preaching's lack of authority, and to the need to supplement preaching with other methods of communication.

⁷Ibid., pp. 1-2.

⁸Ibid., p. 2.

3. Response Problems

A third serious limitation to preaching is the inability of the listeners to respond openly, directly, and immediately. Reid claims this tends to undermine the minister's authority because it hinders close relationship and involvement.⁹ Lack of opportunity to express opposition, questions and feelings could cause unconscious hostility to build in the listener. Because hostility is frowned on by our society, the listener can only express it obliquely through inattention, coughing, or refusal to attend church altogether.

4. Preacher Stereotype

A fourth limitation of preaching is the stereotype in which the preacher is often cast. For example, he can be put in the role of judge. Preaching, because of its authoritative affirmation of the gospel that includes both grace and judgment, places the preacher in a position where his authority is desired, but also feared and rejected. Seward Hiltner and Lowell G. Colston highlight this in a passage where they tell how various counselees tried to make the minister into the kind of authority they wanted him to be:

⁹Ibid., pp. 141-42.

Some tried to treat the pastor as a heavy father who should quickly declare himself so that they could agree with him or fight him. Betty Earle was secretly afraid to talk with him because she "quaked" in the face of authority figures. Yet as she found him to be friendly and understanding she was able to reveal this hidden feeling. Esther Merz was drawn to the pastor as representing the church about which she felt positively, and yet she rather expected he could simply "answer" her religious problems rather than have her sweat over them. Helen Wright initially expected the pastor simply to commend her over her positive religious interest and her attempt to act morally, not realizing that such commendation would have made it impossible to deal with the other feelings that lay underneath. Thus many kinds of expectations were read into the pastor by people at the church.¹⁰

While Hiltner and Colston are referring to the minister as counselor, it would be a fair assumption to say that similar role expectations are thrust on the minister as preacher.

The list of the limitations of preaching could be much longer. However the above four give a glimpse of why the minister's authority is often questioned. Once again, if the dissertation thesis is correct, it is a lack of relationship that is a common denominator in these limitations. First, preaching as an isolated and monological event is inadequate as a sole means of communicating the gospel, because the dimension of dialogical relationship is missing. Second, preaching's apparent weakness in translating words into personal and social change indi-

¹⁰ Seward Hiltner and Lowell G. Colston, The Context of Pastoral Counseling (New York: Abingdon Press, 1961), p. 219.

cates an inability to relate the gospel to persons. Third, lack of opportunity for listeners to respond openly, directly, and immediately to what the preacher is saying in the sermon exposes the need for ways to increase relationship. And fourth, the stereotypes in which the minister is held betrays the lack of close relationship between minister and people. It would be fair, therefore, to suggest that part of the authority problem of the minister arises from certain limitations inherent in preaching as generally practiced, and that these limitations are exacerbated by a lack of close relationship between the minister and his people.

C. CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE PREACHING AND PASTORAL COUNSELING

"The sermon is not an exercise in nondirective counseling. On the contrary, the sermon proclaims, declares, specifies; it is boldly indicative and declarative."¹¹ Thus Kyle Haselden opens up the conflict between the preaching and pastoral roles. And it has been noted by others. Oden sharpens the issue when he prefaces his book with the declaration that:

¹¹Kyle Haselden, The Urgency of Preaching (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 62.

. . . this essay is addressed to the pastor who has become uneasily aware that there is something inconsistent between the content of his preaching and the form of his counseling relations ¹²

Edgar N. Jackson addresses himself to this problem in such a way that Harry Emerson Fosdick declares in the preface:

On one side is the old tradition of authoritative preaching, says the author, and on the other are the new techniques of intimate personal counseling, with all the insights that modern psychology has contributed. These two central functions of the minister cannot be left "contradictory and antithetical," the author maintains, but rather public worship in general and preaching in particular can be rewardingly guided and enriched by the new psychology.¹³

It is Oden who focuses the whole matter when he asks:

Can a humanistic therapy and a theology of revelation be meaningfully and self-consistently conjoined in a single ministry of preaching and counseling? . . . I, myself, as a teacher of theology and pastoral care, have been forced to grapple with this question almost daily. In my classes in theology I have found myself being more and more committed to a demythologized form of the classical Protestant understanding of the radical fallenness of man, alienated from authentic life, in bondage to a false understanding of existence in such a great degree that he is blind to his own predicament of blindness, unaware of his estrangement and of the gift of God's grace in Jesus Christ which provides a new possibility for an approximate self-understanding. In my classes in pastoral care, however, and in counseling students, I find myself just as deeply committed to the assumptions of client-centered therapy, which rely exclusively on the resources for renewal already within the self. I have looked in vain for someone to spell out for me how they are related. If therapists have failed to take

¹²Oden, op. cit., preface.

¹³Edgar N. Jackson, A Psychology For Preaching (Great Neck: Channel Press, 1961), preface.

seriously revelation, theologians have also failed to account for the hidden kerygmatic center of the process of therapy. But if both perspectives can be internalized, how are they interrelated?¹⁴

It would seem that Oden's theology and his approach to counseling are the sources of his dilemma. His theology of revelation is so structured and didactic that it makes little or no room for the insights and methods of pastoral counseling to be integrated into it. Preaching is proclamation of the revealed truth from outside man that man is fallen, whereas counseling is reliance on the sources of renewal already within man. Thus a dilemma inevitably ensues because of Oden's conflicting presuppositions about preaching and counseling. Oden reconciles the two after a lengthy and scholarly discussion that concludes on the note that therapeia and kerygma are actually conjoined in a single mission of service and witness, as seen in Deutero-Isaiah and Jesus' ministry. However, he has not really allowed the insights of psychology to guide and enrich preaching. He is all for therapists taking revelation seriously, and for theologians discovering the kerygma in counseling, but the primary emphasis is always on revelation and the kerygma. It would seem that Jackson and Fosdick promise a more hopeful prospect when they

¹⁴Oden, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

suggest that the old tradition of authoritative preaching can be benefited by the emphasis in counseling on involvement.

D. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Before proceeding several terms need to be defined--preaching, prophetic, pastoral counseling, and pastoral preaching.

1. Preaching

Preaching is not easily defined. The church has struggled with its meaning and method over the centuries. Lectureships like the Beecher Lectures at Yale have produced eloquent descriptions. Preaching, in essence, is proclaiming the gospel, although preaching is not the only way the gospel is proclaimed. More specifically, preaching is structured, verbal communication to a group of people to whom the gospel is explicitly proclaimed.

This raises the question of what the gospel is. The word itself means "good news" and refers to God's revelation of himself in Jesus Christ as gracious and forgiving and accepting of men despite man's inacceptability.¹⁵ It is the good news that in Christ God has sought

¹⁵Van A. Harvey, A Handbook of Theological Terms (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 143-44.

a new relationship with man by reconciling man to himself (i.e., God). Again, one of the key words is relationship, because God's reconciling act brings man into new relationship with himself and others as well as with God.

Nowhere is this good news proclaimed more clearly than in Jesus' homily at the synagogue in Nazareth when he read these words from the prophet Isaiah:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
because he has anointed me to preach
good news to the poor,
He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives
and recovering of sight to the blind,
to set at liberty those who are oppressed,
to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.¹⁶

From this incident we can see several things about preaching that are basic and characteristic. First, preaching should be primarily biblical in that it is rooted and grounded in scripture and the biblical witness to God's love whether one preaches from a text or not. Second, it should be, as Haselden says, boldly indicative and declarative rather than interrogative and hortatory. Third, it should be prophetic in that it is addressed vigorously toward the real problems of people in the light of the eternal truths of the Bible. As Linn in his study of the preaching of Harry Emerson Fosdick has said:

¹⁶Luke 4:18-19, R.S.V.

The goal of all preaching, including the counseling method, is to demonstrate the saving grace of the gospel of Jesus Christ when it is focused upon any problem in any life. The preacher is not merely a kindly nursemaid of malingering and ailing souls. He is also a proclaimer of the stern, prophetic truths of God which every age should hear.¹⁷

And fourth, preaching should be pastoral in that it is sensitive to the needs of persons. This can only come about as the preacher is in close relationship with his congregation before, during, and after the act of preaching itself.

So preaching then is a proclamation of the gospel that in Jesus Christ we discover God loves us with an accepting and forgiving love that reconciles us to ourselves, to others, and to God. To do this, preaching must be biblically rooted, boldly declarative, prophetically relevant, and pastorally sensitive.

2. Prophetic

What does one mean when one says preaching is prophetic? That it is like the preaching of the Old Testament prophets? That it deals with current controversial issues? That it is a passionate and dramatic witness rather than a cool, detached and rational explanation? That it is a proclaiming of judgment on men and nations without fear or favor? These are only popular ideas of

¹⁷Linn, op. cit., p. 23.

the prophetic office. After a careful study of Gerhard von Rad's Old Testament theology, one can only conclude he is correct when he states:

One of our special tasks here will be to show how a number of different concepts of the prophets' of-five and teaching current from the eighth to the sixth centuries came to be embraced by the one term NABI.¹⁸

Here are some of the different concepts and roles: charismatic leader,¹⁹ defender and preserver of Israel,²⁰ oracle,²¹ messenger of Jahweh,²² foreteller of the future,²³ spokesman for the cult,²⁴ spokesman for God,²⁵ teacher,²⁶ assayer and judge,²⁷ respecter of the power of God's word,²⁸ eschatologist,²⁹ and sufferer.³⁰ No contemporary preacher could hope to encompass all these roles, particularly when one considers the prophets' devastatingly negative outlook on the future of their work, and the way in which, without any illusions, they faced up to its failure. In this sense they were completely

¹⁸Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), Vol. II, p. 7.

¹⁹Ibid., II, 27.

²⁰Ibid., II, 29.

²¹Ibid., II, 37.

²²Ibid., II, 37.

²³Ibid., II, 42.

²⁴Ibid., II, 52.

²⁵Ibid., II, 63.

²⁶Ibid., II, 73.

²⁷Ibid., II, 74.

²⁸Ibid., II, 85.

²⁹Ibid., II, 118.

³⁰Ibid., II, 208.

outside the cult as no preacher who pastors a church can be. They were confronting, but with no concern for involvement.

It is only when we study Deutero-Isaiah that we begin to understand Jesus' attraction to him. And if we are called as preachers to be prophetic as Jesus was, then we must recognize the source of his prophetic spirit in Deutero-Isaiah. Von Rad helps us at this juncture when he points out about Deutero-Isaiah that:

Never before had Jahweh spoken in such a way by the lips of a prophet. Never before had he come so close to his people when he addressed them, laying aside anything which might alarm them in case he should terrify one of those who had lost heart. In these dialogues the prophet brings every possible means of persuasion into play. He appeals now to reason, now to emotion. He gives arguments and proofs. As Deutero-Isaiah entices and woos the heart of Israel, hardened by excessive suffering, he uses terms which expose the heart of his God almost shamefully . . . And if the question be put, why the accusations which were so prominent in the pre-exilic prophets fall into the background with Deutero-Isaiah, and why it is only with him that the message of Jahweh's invincible love bursts out with such mighty power, the answer is that Jahweh has forgiven his people. The prophet looks upon this forgiveness as an unlooked for event which it is his task to voice in this special hour of history.³¹

It was this message of God's love and forgiveness that Jesus expressed and incarnated. It has confrontation, but with loving involvement.

³¹Ibid., II, 250.

To be prophetic, then, means to try to show God's compassionate involvement with men in all dimensions of their lives. It means to be concerned with the way God works and to try to make these ways clear to men. There is nothing outside the jurisdiction of the prophet's concern. Anything that affects men is his rightful territory. For the prophet is a man of God, standing in the midst of the world, trying to understand the mystery of human existence, and attempting to build a relationship between God and man.

3. Pastoral Counseling

This phrase, pastoral counseling, brings together two concepts and disciplines, that of the pastor and that of the counselor. The office of pastor as shepherd of the flock is ancient and covers all of the ministries he brings to his flock. With the development of insights into human personality through psychology, it was inevitable that pastors would begin to learn and use these insights in their pastoring. So in the use of this term "pastoral counseling" the word "pastor" is the primary and more inclusive term. But to be a pastor in the full sense of that word today means that one can hardly avoid doing some counseling.

There may be some danger that pastoral counseling be considered to be the modern method of ministry, rather

than a way of approaching one aspect of the traditional work of the minister with new tools and resources. Gibson Winter has been quick to point out the practical limitations of the former:

The churches are attempting to cope with the crisis of person and community largely through the pastorate of the clergymen to individuals; indeed, many clergy are now very skilled in the field of counseling and provide a free service which is comparable to some of the best psychological counseling. However, the increasing demand for personal attention and the lack of communal structures in which men and women can find a healthy interpersonal environment create a cul de sac for the clergy and the churches. The clergyman has very few institutional controls to protect him in counseling relationships; meanwhile the churches become leaderless as clergy are diverted to endless individual cases. Of course, the clergy are attracted to this counseling role because they have a kind of "Catcher in the Rye" complex and feel significant as helpers of the weak. This is very treacherous ground, however, since personal entanglement in these deeper, psychological disturbances is all but inevitable without the controls of regular office hours, set fees and associated professional advice at regular intervals.³²

There is a further reason for professional self-limitation by the pastor that goes beyond practical considerations of neglecting other people and other essential duties. It has more to do with the fact that most pastors are not equipped to do a basic psychotherapeutic job. Because there is a real but not a categorical difference between counseling and psychotherapy. Hiltner and Colston cite William C. Perry on this point:

³²Gibson Winter, The New Creation as Metropolis (New York: Macmillan, 1963), pp. 116-17.

Like William C. Perry, we see these two on a continuum with radically different emphases at the two ends but an area in between that cannot easily be compartmentalized. Perry, who first formulated this view of the relationship, saw the psychotherapy end of the continuum as involving problems that are primarily intra-psychic in nature. That is to say, not much else can be done to help the person until he can be aided to deal with his relatively deep inner conflicts. Conversely, Perry saw the counseling end of the continuum as involving problems in which a more or less integrated person--with no deeper inner conflicts than most people have--nevertheless requires special help in dealing with some problem area or areas of life.³³

It is therefore important that the pastor learn how to create, out of a previous general pastor-parishioner relationship, a special and temporary helping relationship--and with the recognition that, upon conclusion of the special and temporary relationship, the general relationship will be resumed. Hiltner and Colston declare that difficulty arises when the pastor does not make clear the temporary change in relationship and thereby leaves the issue cloudy.³⁴ This is particularly easy to do when the pastor-parishioner relationship has been particularly close and on a warm, friendly basis.

But let us be clear that pastoral counseling is different from all other counseling in that the pastor represents a concerned religious community and what it stands for. The pastor assumes that it is written into

³³Hiltner and Colston, op. cit., p. 28.

³⁴Ibid., p. 38.

the universe that the individual is acceptable. In rare instances he may even witness to this in meaningful, overtly-theological way. But usually he proceeds silently with this pre-supposition which, hopefully, will be sensed by the clients he counsels. Whether this is helpful will depend on the skill and genuineness of the pastor and the attitude of the counselee. For the authority of the pastoral counselor lies not only in his skill and experience as a counselor, but even more in the way in which he reflects the love and acceptance of God.

Pastoral counseling, then, is a temporary helping relationship, clearly defined by the pastor, in which he uses the insights of psychology to deal with problems that are not of a deep intrapsychic nature, and does so in such a way as to reflect the love of God and of a concerned religious community.

4. Pastoral Preaching

This phrase, pastoral preaching, is one way of conceptualizing a bridge between preaching and counseling and of helping to resolve the conflict between the preaching and pastoral roles. It suggests that there is something complementary about preaching and pastoring, with each serving to fulfill the other. In the definition of preaching given earlier, one of the criteria was that it must be "pastorally sensitive." Preaching is more than

simple proclamation. It is an attempt to relate the gospel to persons, and this can happen only when the pastor is in close enough relationship with his people to sense their needs. This relationship has direct beneficial results in and of itself by allowing the minister and parishioner to experience each other as persons. It also helps the pastor sharpen the focus of his preaching. And it can increase the congregation's responsiveness to preaching. Reid reports significant findings to support this:

A high percentage of group members reported that they became more responsive to preaching as a result of their group experience. Some extended this responsiveness to worship as a whole. A majority revealed that they understood their ministers' sermons better, felt the preaching to be more applicable to their personal needs, and were more sensitive to the preaching of the sermon, as a result of their group membership.³⁵

Pastoral preaching, then, is preaching that is pastorally sensitive. It arises out of a close relationship between pastor and people that tends to make the pastor more responsive to the needs of his people and the people more responsive to the preaching.

³⁵ Reid, op. cit., p. 139.

E. AFFINITIES BETWEEN PREACHING AND PASTORAL COUNSELING

If what has just been suggested is true, then there are some strong affinities between preaching and pastoral counseling. Preaching depends on counseling for recognition of needs. And sensitive preaching can enhance the work of the pastor by revealing his sensitivity to his congregation's needs. This is not to suggest that there is no difference in function between preaching and counseling. However, difference of function does not necessarily imply difference of content.

Thomas C. Oden has made a thorough study of the gospel record to show that kerygma and therapeia belong in the person, ministry and teachings of Jesus:

The Servant-Messiah was remembered as one who uniquely blended the dual ministries of kerygma and therapeia in genuine involvement with the world. He "went throughout all Galilee, preaching in their synagogues and casting out demons." (Mark 1:39). Great multitudes of people came "to hear him and to be healed of their diseases" (Luke 6:17). "Now when the sun was setting, all those who had any that were sick with various diseases brought them to him; and he laid his hands on every one of them and healed them . . . He said to them, 'I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose.'" (Luke 4:40-43)

The twofold thrust of the apostolic mission is summarized in Jesus' instructions to the Twelve: "And preach (keryssete) as you go, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Heal (therapeute) the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons" (Matt. 10:7-8). According to Luke's Gospel, "They departed and went through the villages, preaching (evangelizomenoi) the gospel and healing

(therapeuontes) everywhere" (Luke 9:6). In the sending of the seventy, their commission included the same dual focus: "Heal the sick . . . and say to them, 'The Kingdom of God has come near to you'" (Luke 10:8). It seems to be a very deliberate matter that therapeis and kerygma are conjoined in a single mission of service and witness.³⁶

The problem that arises in Oden's synthesis is that while he sees the kerygma in therapeia, he does not see the therapeia in kerygma. It is a one way relationship that denies a basic point of this dissertation--namely that preaching and counseling are dynamically and inseparably bound together.

1. Preaching as Counseling

Arthur L. Teikmanis suggests that " . . . preaching is pastoral care in the context of worship."³⁷ True preaching is not a generalization, nor is it a monologue; it is always directed to the needs of the worshippers. It arises out of close involvement with the congregation on the part of the pastor. When this involvement occurs, the pastor becomes aware of what people want from him through his sermons. Edgar Jackson reports on a questionnaire that queried the man in the pew on what he wanted in sermons:

³⁶Oden, op. cit., p. 153.

³⁷Arthur L. Teikmanis, Preaching and Pastoral Care (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 12.

About half of the four thousand queried indicated a concern about intensely personal matters, such as the futility of life, insecurity in personal relations, a haunting sense of loneliness, problems that involve marriage and the proper control of the sex drives, the effect of alcohol, false ideas of religion and morals, a feeling of inferiority, the problem of suffering as well as the problems of illness, and the feelings of guilt and frustration. Another fourth of those who responded were concerned about family problems, parenthood and child training, infidelity, religious differences, and other problems that were symptoms of tensions in human relations. The remainder and relatively small minority were concerned about social, community and the more traditional religious problems. So the man in the pew indicated by an overwhelming percentage that his problems were those that grow out of immaturity, inner conflict, and aggressive behavior. His were the problems of making himself a fit person to live with. He wanted to know how to grow into this abundant life that the church talks about.³⁸

Along the same line, sensitive preaching on the real needs of people can open up the possibility of counseling. Jackson demonstrated this in his book.³⁹ James A. Knight, M.D. discovered the same thing in his work of teaching:

Lecturing to students on sensitive themes may be a form of confrontation when the lecture was not intended for that purpose. Lectures on adolescent problems, counseling the dying patient, suicide, management of the seductive patient, the interaction of religion and medicine, and similar topics strike many students at vulnerable points. Some come later to see the lecturer and discuss immediately and frankly their personal problems relating to the theme in question.

³⁸ Jackson, op. cit., p. 75.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 57.

In lecturing to both medical and theological students, I have observed the same response to sensitive themes.⁴⁰

So in one sense, preaching can be a calling of men to their personal needs. However it can also be a calling of men to community and world needs. And when this kind of preaching is done effectively--that is, with ample opportunity for the listener to feel back--it can create a kind of dialogue. As such it has some of the qualities of personal counseling, and will in all probability lead to requests for individual consultation.

2. Counseling as Proclamation

It is important to recognize that while preaching can incorporate the insights and techniques of counseling in the proclamation of the gospel, counseling can also include proclamation. Generally in counseling this proclamation is implicitly assumed rather than explicitly proclaimed. However, there are times when the pastoral counselor may be explicit in pointing the counselee directly to God as the source of healing. This can be done without violating the definition of pastoral counseling given

⁴⁰James A. Knight, "Confrontation in Counseling with Special Emphasis on the Student Setting," Pastoral Psychology, XVI:159 (December 1965), 52-53.

earlier as a helping relationship that reflects the love of God and of a concerned religious community.

The priestly functions of the pastor offer one way for him to move from counseling toward more overt expressions of the gospel without destroying the counseling relationship. Howard J. Clinebell, Jr. cites such an instance:

After extended counseling with a man crippled by guilt from the irreparable damage he had done another, a minister suggested that they go together to the church sanctuary. Wearing his pulpit robe to symbolize his priestly or representative function, he invited the man to pray for an awareness of God's forgiveness as he knelt at the Communion railing. Then the minister gave a prayer of absolution and the two joined in the Lord's prayer. The priestly acts were, in this case, bearers of the "reconciling symbols" of Christianity by which guilt can be transformed and transcended (Tillich). They were channels of grace by which forgiveness came alive for that man. It should be noted that the effectiveness of the priestly acts was built on the foundation of a meaningful counseling experience.⁴¹

Above all else, the pastor as counselor carries with him the kerygmatic assumptions whether he ever proclaims them in the counseling relationship or not. That is why his counseling is in a very real sense a kind of proclamation.

⁴¹Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 227.

F. DIRECTIONS IN WHICH A SOLUTION MAY LIE

We began by focusing on the problem of the authority of the minister, particularly the conflicts between the confronting and comforting aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. How does he proclaim the gospel with loyalty to its confrontational aspects without losing a trusting pastoral relationship and respect for his leadership? This way of stating the problem implies there are two aspects to it--confrontation and relationship--and therefore two parts to the solution.

First, no minister can hope to maintain his authority if he does not proclaim the gospel with integrity to himself and the gospel. If he hedges because he fears offending, he is no preacher in the Christian sense of the word. He will not be respected because he will not respect himself. And second, if he tries to relate the gospel to his congregation without being in relationship with them, he will never speak to them with the authority of one who knows them and their needs well enough to speak a saving word in a way they can hear and understand. Again, his authority will be lost.

The direction in which the answer to the first part of this problem may lie--the problem of proclaiming a gospel that is sometimes confronting--has been suggested by

Jackson.⁴² He tells of an experiment he made in preaching at the church he served. It was an attempt to measure congregation response to "markedly different styles of sermonic approach, both as to content, method, and purpose." This included "the use of trained observers to gauge the immediate response of the listeners to what was said,"⁴³ as well as any delayed response reflected in requests for counseling during the period of several months while the sixteen sermons in the series were given. The sermons were of two general classifications and were given on alternating Sundays. The first were what can be called repressive-inspirational in method and the second were analytic:

In the repressive-inspirational sermons the material was exclusively positive and optimistic. The illustrations dwelt on the heroic in life. Questions were not thrown in people's faces, but affirmations were stressed. Inspirational ideas and inspirational poetry were freely utilized. When the sermons approached their conclusions, no sense of self-conscious introspection was employed, but rather an outgoing feeling of good will and acceptance, and each point was sealed with a bit of scripture or inspirational poetry.

In the analytical sermons a searching look was taken into life and its meaning with the burden of responsibility for acts and attitudes placed squarely upon man. The measuring stick of the person of Christ was held up clearly as the ultimate guide in adequate

⁴²Jackson, op. cit., Chapter 2.

⁴³Ibid., p. 49.

living. The listeners were urged to look in upon their lives with a concern for correction, a desire to lead a new life with the help of the religious resources available to them.⁴⁴

In the immediate response to the repressive-inspirational sermons, as observed by trained observers of groups, was a "comfortable, relaxed feeling in the congregation The members of the group seemed to participate as a group bound together in a mood of pleasure and confidence, and there was little or no coughing Coughing is about the only acceptable way a listener can express his displeasure, defense or rejection."⁴⁵ The comments to the preacher afterward were of the following kind: "Your sermon was so helpful," or "You said just what I needed to hear." Jackson notes that, "It was highly significant that during the weeks following the repressive-inspirational sermons . . . there were no counseling relations established."⁴⁶

The response following the analytic sermons was noticeably different. The mood of the congregation was attentive, but "the group seemed to be broken up into individuals as questions were asked that had to be dealt with on individual terms The sense of joy and responsiveness was replaced by a mood of introspection and

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 54, 55.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 56, 57, 58.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 57.

uncomfortable self-examination."⁴⁷ Even the preacher noticed almost a mood of antagonism. And the degree of coughing was much higher during these analytic sermons. Remarks afterward to the preacher were of the following type: "You were talking straight to me," or "That was a thoughtful sermon." Jackson comments that the most significant reaction was the fact that, "During the eight weeks that followed the analytic type of sermon, over two-hundred hours of pastoral counseling were begun."⁴⁸

If this experiment says anything for the purpose of this dissertation, it is that the analytic or confronting kind of sermon can be preached, not only without breaking the pastor's relationship with his people--though it may be broken with some--but in many cases with a deepening relationship with his people.

The direction in which the answer to the second part of the problem of this dissertation may lie--namely that of the relationship of the minister and his congregation--has been suggested by Reid:

Since two-way communication can take place dramatically in face-to-face groups, and since preaching needs to be revitalized today, this dissertation attempts to explore some ways in which two-way communication in small groups may strengthen the impartation of the gospel through preaching. The study assumes a relationship between preaching and small,

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 57, 58.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 58.

face-to-face groups in the life of the Church with two-way communication as one concept that links them together.⁴⁹

This is not new to Methodist practice. John Wesley developed the Class Meeting in the eighteenth century in apparent recognition that preaching alone is not enough to keep persons growing in their understanding of Christian faith. The Oxford Group movement is another aspect of small groups meeting for purposes of religious growth and instruction. Reid cites Elton Trueblood in suggesting that the present hope for preaching lies in the development of small face-to-face groups in the church:

Among the most novel features of contemporary Christianity, especially in its Protestant forms, are the small fellowship groups. Though nearly all of the growth of these has taken place during the few years since the end of the Second World War, such groups are now numbered by the thousands in the United States alone ⁵⁰

The clear implication is that small group relationships involving the minister are the key to the kind of involvement that both facilitates confrontation and at the same time enhances the minister's authority. Earlier in this chapter in a section entitled "Pastoral Preaching" there is a citation from Reid claiming that members of small

⁴⁹Reid, op. cit., p. 4.

⁵⁰Elton Trueblood, The Yoke of Christ and Other Sermons (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 172-73.

groups were more responsive to the preaching and to the preacher in a positive way. If Reid is right--and it is the position of this paper that he is--then relationship is the sine qua non of preaching and a key to the problem of the authority of the minister. For with a strong relationship between minister and people in terms of openness, trust and concern for each other, the minister can dare to preach the truth (confrontation) in the hope that it will thereby strengthen his authority by enhancing his leadership.

A model for a possible solution to this conflict is William Glasser's Reality Therapy wherein confrontation and involvement are dynamically related. A consideration of Glasser's approach follows in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

WILLIAM GLASSER'S REALITY THERAPY AS A MODEL OF A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

William Glasser, M.D., is a psychiatrist who divides his time between private practice and consulting work with prisons, mental hospitals and public schools. His book Reality Therapy is sub-titled A New Approach to Psychiatry. There is a real question as to whether his approach is genuinely "new." In an article about Glasser, Jack Langguth reports that one well-known analyst says Reality Therapy is only Adler again and fifty years late.¹ Glasser does not deny this similarity. In response to this charge, he said, "I've never claimed that my ideas are new or novel. All I say is that people are listening to me, and they're not listening to Adler."² Glasser and Adler, among others, urge the therapist to take a more active part in the therapeutic process than do those who follow the more traditional psychoanalytic approach:

Ferenczi was among the first to employ a more active method. In his "activity therapy," he introduced certain prohibitions, such as against acting out, masturbation, defensive logorrhea, etc. In another

¹Jack Langguth, "William Glasser: California's Gift to Psychotherapy," Harper's Magazine, CCXXXIV:1405 (June 1967), 52.

²Ibid., 52.

phase, he believed in certain ways of conveying approval and acceptance which the patient had lacked in his previous development. Under pressure from Freud, Ferenczi abandoned his "departure from psychoanalysis." Wilhelm Reich the author of Character Analysis, came to certain conclusions regarding the desirability of more active interpretation while conducting the Vienna Seminar for Psychoanalytic Therapy during the '20's. Essentially, he believed that the patient's defenses had to be systematically and sequentially dealt with, since the optimal goal was not mere symptomatic relief, but a change in the basic defensive patterns of the personality. Ferenczi and Reich suffered for being innovators, but they were also producers. Horney, Fromm, Sullivan, and Fromm-Reichmann pioneered a developing new set of concepts, which involve certain basic changes in theory, a shift away from the idea of absolute psychic determination and toward a greater emphasis on the possibility of freedom of choice; in practice, toward therapy as a transactional process between equals, in which the therapist is involved as a participant-observer.³

Glasser falls within this general grouping, but goes far beyond any of them in these emphases. He is in conflict with much current psychiatric thinking, as we shall see later. Basically he is an innovator both in theory and in practice, and his reported success in treating some of the most difficult kinds of psychiatric disturbances--long-time psychotics in mental hospital and hardened juvenile character disorders in a state school--suggests that he must be taken into account.

³Harry H. Gardner and Robert F. Jeans, "Confrontation Technique in Psychotherapy: Some Existential Implications," Journal of Existential Psychiatry, II:8 (Spring 1962), 394-95.

With respect to the relevance of his approach to the subject at hand, Glasser brings involvement and confrontation together in a way that is applicable to the confronting and sustaining aspects of the minister's preaching and pastoral roles. Before proceeding with an exposition of this, it will be in order to define three key terms in Glasser's Reality Therapy--reality, responsibility, and right and wrong.

A. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Reality

Reality therapy implies that people are treated with therapy and within the context of reality. This central concept in Glasser's therapy eludes specific definition. In writing about reality, he comments:

In their unsuccessful effort to fulfill their needs, no matter what behavior they choose, all patients have a common characteristic: They all deny the reality of the world around them. Some break the law, denying the rules of society; some claim their neighbors are plotting against them, denying the improbability of such behavior. Some are afraid of crowded places, close quarters, airplanes, or elevators. Yet they freely admit the irrationality of their fears. Millions drink to blot out the inadequacy they feel but that need not exist if they could learn to be different; and far too many people choose suicide rather than face the reality that they could solve their problems by more responsible behavior. Whether it is a partial denial or the total blotting out of all reality of the chronic back-ward patient in the state hospital, the denial of some or all of reality is common to all patients. Therapy will be

successful when they are able to give up denying the world and to recognize that reality not only exists but that they must fulfill their needs within its framework.⁴

At a Ministers' Convocation⁵ address in Claremont, Glasser stated that reality is determined by what the majority of people in the place one happens to be believe at a certain time. If the "crazy" people become the majority, as in Nazi Germany, then Reality will be "crazy." So reality is the way the majority of people believe and function, whether one likes it or not. A person can choose either to be afraid of reality (conventionally described as neurotic), or to deny reality (psychotic), or he can try to live in harmony with it.

2. Responsibility:

This key word in reality therapy encompasses most of the usual meanings of the word, but in addition it has a specific psychiatric meaning:

Responsibility, a concept basic to Reality Therapy, is defined as the ability to fulfill one's needs, and to do so in a way that does not deprive others of the ability to fulfill their needs A responsible person also does that which gives him a feeling of

⁴William Glasser, Reality Therapy (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 6.

⁵William Glasser, address at Southern California Council of Churches Ministers' Convocation, Claremont Congregational Church, January 24, 1967.

self-worth and a feeling that he is worthwhile to others. He is motivated to strive and perhaps endure privation to attain self-worth. When a responsible man says that he will perform a job for us, he will try to accomplish what was asked, both for us and so that he may gain a measure of self-worth for himself. An irresponsible person may or may not do what he says, depending upon how he feels, the effort he has to make, and what is in it for him. He gains neither our respect nor his own, and in time he will suffer or cause others to suffer.⁶

In commenting on Glasser's use of the word, O. Hobart Mowrer cites a statement by Glasser that "people do not act irresponsibly because they are 'ill'; they are 'ill' because they act irresponsibly." "This," says Mowrer, "is an emphasis that has been almost totally absent in classical psychoanalysis. For Freud and many of his followers, the neurotic's problem is not irresponsibility, but lack of 'insight.'" ⁷ Glasser reverses this and declares that irresponsibility is the cause of neurosis. He therefore shifts the emphasis for the person who has been living irresponsibly (whether neurotic, psychotic or delinquent) away from "responsibility for" what happened in the past to "responsible living" in the present.

3. Right and wrong:

There is a strong moral emphasis in Glasser. Right and wrong are important categories, and the avoidance of

⁶Glasser, Reality Therapy, pp. 13, 14.

⁷Ibid., p. xv.

value judgments on our behavior is tantamount to irresponsibility. However his emphasis on value judgments must be understood from within the context of his system, and not in terms of conventional psychiatry:

To be worthwhile we must maintain a satisfactory standard of behavior. To do so we must learn to correct ourselves when we do wrong and to credit ourselves when we do right. If we do not evaluate our own behavior or, having evaluated it, if we do not act to improve our conduct where it is below our standards, we will not fulfill our needs to be worthwhile and will suffer as acutely as when we fail to love or be loved. Morals, standards, values, or right and wrong behavior are all intimately related to the fulfillment of our needs for self-worth and are . . . a necessary part of Reality Therapy.⁸

Glasser asserts that his therapy reverses the emphasis in conventional psychiatry, that neurosis is caused by the person's having been too good because he is under the domination of his superego. The job of psychiatry based on Freudian theory is to alleviate the demands of the superego and let the person enjoy his instincts. Reality therapy, on the other hand, insists that the person's emotional problems arise, not because he has been too good, but because he has not lived up to his own moral standards.

B. AN OUTLINE OF GLASSER'S APPROACH

Having defined these three basic terms, we are ready to turn to an outline of Glasser's approach. There

⁸Ibid., pp. 10-11.

are essentially four steps--recognition of needs, involvement, confrontation, and helping the client learn new ways. This will be followed by an evaluation of the dangers and strengths of Glasser's approach.

1. Recognition of Man's Basic Human Needs

Everyone has needs, basic needs. Glasser acknowledges this in saying:

It is not enough to help a patient face reality; he must also learn to fulfill his needs. Previously when he attempted to fulfill his needs in the real world, he was unsuccessful. He began to deny the real world and to try to fulfill his needs as if some aspects of the world did not exist or in defiance of their existence. A psychotic patient who lives in a world of his own and a delinquent boy who repeatedly breaks the law are common examples of these two conditions. Even a man with a stomach ulcer who seems to be facing reality in every way is upon investigation often found to be attempting more than he can cope with, and his ulcer is his body's reaction to the excess stress. Therefore, to do Reality Therapy the therapist must not only be able to help the patient accept the real world, but he must then further help him fulfill his needs in the real world so that he will have no inclination in the future to deny its existence.⁹

The basic need of every human being is for identity, to feel that he has some uniqueness about himself. Glasser notes two major ways that an individual can successfully find and keep his identity. Each of these is as basic as identity itself, and each is a need also.

⁹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

The need to love and be loved. Love, according to Glasser, is characteristic of many of our human relationships, including mother love, father love, sibling love, friendship, as well as married love. There is never a time in our lives, says Glasser, when we do not need both to love and to be loved. Deprivation of either, can lead to emotional suffering of varying degrees all the way from minor emotional upsets to complete withdrawal from the world. Therefore it is imperative that a person find at least one other person, hopefully a few more, whom he can love and who can love him.

The need to feel worthwhile. Glasser claims that the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others is equal in importance to the need to love and be loved. These two needs, although separate, usually go together. The person who loves and receives love usually feels worthwhile, and the person who feels worthwhile to himself and others is usually a person who is loved by others and can give them love in return. However, the ability just to receive love does not give him worth. He must do something or be something or achieve something so that others recognize his worth--and so that he recognizes his own worth whether anyone else does or not.

2. Involvement with Others

Glasser asserts that if we are ever going to help people to fulfill their needs and thereby gain a worthwhile identity, then we have to become involved with them. The therapist must make himself available to them and reveal himself to them in the hope that they will reveal themselves and begin to understand that he cares and that they need not be so lonely. For it is when people are lonely that they become desperate and make bad choices, says Glasser. They may then do just the opposite of what is good for them. In their loneliness they run away from people because they cannot stand the pain of being with people and not being involved. This is why Glasser says:

Usually the most difficult phase of therapy is the first, the gaining of the involvement that the patient so desperately needs but which he has been unsuccessful in attaining or maintaining up to the time he comes for treatment. Unless the requisite involvement exists between the necessarily responsible therapist and the irresponsible patient, there can be no therapy. The guiding principles of Reality Therapy are directed toward achieving the proper involvement. It is a completely honest, human relationship in which the patient, for perhaps the first time in his life, realizes that someone cares enough about him not only to accept him but to help him fulfill his needs in the real world.¹⁰

This raises the whole question as to how the therapist effects involvement. Glasser sees the patient as one who has difficulty in establishing good emotional

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 21.

relationships. This in turn frustrates this fulfilling of the patient's need for someone to care about him. It is the therapist's job to help the patient become emotionally involved with him. And this can only be accomplished by the therapist's really caring for the patient.

Glasser is very careful to distinguish between involvement and the classical psychoanalytic concept of transference. In transference the therapist becomes the passive object on which the patient projects his neurotic expectations of an authoritative father figure, until that critical moment when the therapist reveals himself as an accepting, permissive person in such a way as to break down the overweening demands of the superego. Involvement, on the other hand, is an active relationship characterized by candor, openness, and confrontation. And this requires many strengths in the therapist:

He must have the strength to become involved, to have his values tested by the patient, and to withstand intense criticism by the person he is trying to help. Every fault and defeat may be picked apart by the patient. Willing to admit that, like the patient, he is far from perfect, the therapist must nevertheless show that a person can act responsibly even if it takes great effort . . . An important distinguishing trait of a good psychotherapist is his ability to accept patients uncritically and understand their behavior. He must never be frightened or rebuffed by the patient's behavior no matter how aberrant it is. One way patients test the therapist is by acting irrationally . . . Finally, the therapist must be able to become emotionally involved with each patient. To some extent he must be affected by the patient and his problems and even suffer with him. The therapist

who can work with seriously irresponsible people and not be affected by their suffering will never become sufficiently involved to do successful therapy.¹¹

The emphasis on involvement is not unique with Glasser, though it is central in his system. Many therapists make reference to it as perhaps the central or key aspect of successful therapy. Thomas C. Oden cites two studies that indicate the importance of what Glasser terms involvement.¹² The first study was in 1950 by R. W. Heine¹³ who discovered that patients experience very similar changes in their behavior even though they are being treated by therapists of very different schools. The one thing that the patients seemed to experience as the most effective and helpful aspect of their treatment was being understood by the therapist. The second study, nine years later, by Fred E. Fiedler¹⁴ investigated the therapists'

¹¹Ibid., pp. 22, 23, 24.

¹²Thomas G. Oden, Kerygma and Counseling (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 37-38.

¹³R. W. Heine, "A Comparison of Patients' Reports on Psychotherapeutic Experience with Psychoanalytic, Non-Directive and Adlerian Therapists," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950).

¹⁴Fred E. Fiedler, "A Comparative Investigation of Early Therapeutic Relationships Created by Non-experts of the Psychoanalytic, Non-directive and Adlerian Schools," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959).

rather than the patients' experience as in the Heine study. Fiedler discovered that expert therapists from these varied orientations experienced the therapeutic relationship in similar ways. They described this relationship as one in which the therapist was able to empathize thoroughly with the patient's internal communication.

Oden's comments on Carl Rogers can apply to reality therapy as well:

(a) When one person exists in a state of incongruence, being vulnerable or anxious, and (b) another congruent person meets him with unconditional positive regard, entering into his frame of reference with empathetic understanding, and (c) when the troubled individual perceives himself as recipient of this unconditional positive regard and empathetic understanding, (d) then growth toward fuller human functioning occurs, the syndrome of bondage is broken, the self is offered the possibility of renewal and self-reconciliation. In a moment of bold confidence in the efficacy of this saving relationship, Rogers goes so far as to argue that when these conditions are present, "constructive personal development will invariably occur." Rogers' view is sometimes called "relationship therapy" since its basic hypothesis is that there is a certain type of relationship through which troubled persons discover within themselves "the capacity to use that relationship for growth." Nothing else saves, not technique, not experience, not diagnosis, not medications, not incisive analysis--none of these suffice to free the individual from the particular bondage of the will of which we have spoken; only the unconditional positive regard of a congruent empathetic neighbor.¹⁵

In summary, Glasser says about involvement that one must have at least one other person whom he cares about and who cares about him in order to fulfill basic needs to

¹⁵Oden, op. cit., pp. 97-98.

love and be loved. At its best, the therapeutic relationship between therapist and client provides this kind of involvement.

3. Confrontation about Behavior

Confrontation is the core of Glasser's therapy, once the relationship has been established through involvement. By confrontation Glasser means facing the patient with his unrealistic behavior while still accepting him and maintaining involvement with him. Glasser gave an example of confrontation:

At Ventura not long ago I was working with a girl. I did not know her too well at the time, but I knew her a little bit, and when I walked into the cottage the house mother said to me, "Go down the hallway. Sherry is in her room. She had a terrible blow-up and cussed me out and I told her to go to her room to cool off. She is in there. Maybe you ought to go talk to her." So I went to talk to her. She is an intelligent, seventeen year old girl whom I knew only moderately well. So I went down and said, "Sherry, what are you doing in here? What happened?" She said, "The old so-and-so said such-and-such and I told her where she could go etc. etc. and here I am." I said, "Well, what do you think about this?" She said, "Well, I will stay here for a while and then I will get out of the room." I agreed that she would and there was no more sense in elaborating that point, but I wanted to talk to her to some extent even further. I said, "Sherry, what are your plans? What are you doing here? What do you plan to do when you leave?" She said, "When I leave here I want to go back to San Jose and get loaded and stay loaded and be loaded. That's what I want to do." It would be very tempting to say to her at this point, "Kid, you are never going to leave here if that is your attitude. I will keep you in this room, or you've got the wrong idea, and all that kind of thing. And she, of course, was waiting for me to say this. She is a bright girl and she was

surprised. And I said, "Well, O.K. This doesn't sound too bad to me. If that is what you want to do." She said, "Yes." I said, "O.K. Fine. Do you understand the problems involved in doing it?" She said, "Oh, yes." I said, "Here you have been locked up for almost a year and this could happen over and over again. So if you want to do it, it is certainly your choice." She said, "Oh, yes, Dr. Glasser. This is exactly what I want to do." So I said, "Well, there is no sense talking too much more about that. That is your choice. You have been loaded in the past. If you want to continue to be loaded, this is just an unfortunate hiatus in being here at this school. However, you will be getting out pretty soon and I can only give you one word of advice. If your goal in life is to be loaded, obviously you can't do that here. There are no drugs available at Ventura. So it seems to me that the smart thing to do would be to get along as well as possible in our program. In which case we will let you go and you can get back to San Jose and become loaded without waiting so long with this interval." Well, she was kind of disappointed when I said that. I didn't play the role I am supposed to play. And she said, "You would let me out even though I say something like that?" I said, "Sure, I only judge you by what you are doing now. You tell me you are going to get loaded in San Jose. That makes no difference to me. If you get along well in our program and you talk to Mrs. So-and-So in a nice way and you don't hassel her and go to school, we will let you out. We can't foresee the future. If you say you want to get loaded, you are leaving with the so-called attitude. So what, a lot of people have bad attitudes." Well, the kid was pretty shook up by this discussion. She met some kind of a crazy psychiatrist. So three days later when I was back at the school and I was walking across the campus she came running to me and said, "Dr. Glasser, I've got to talk to you about what we were talking about yesterday." I said, "Well, O.K. I thought we had it all solved." She said, "No, I want to talk to you some more." And I said, "What is on your mind?" And she said, "I have decided I am going to go to work. I am going to work eight hours a day, and save my money and get loaded the other sixteen." Now, hell, this is a 33% improvement. Very few people effect that much psycho-therapy in a matter of three days. I wasn't disappointed at all. The point is the kid now knew what the score was. And she changed. Instead of doing that she went out to San Jose and got a job and

became married shortly after that and as far as I have heard she is doing very well in the community. But the point is I gave her the opportunity to change and left the reality to her.¹⁶

This illustration will illustrate Glasser's concept and method of confrontation.

Confrontation, like involvement, is not unique with Glasser. Garner and Jeans, state:

In general, any effective psychotherapy must involve some "confrontation" of the patient, some pointing up of his particular kind of evasiveness, and in such a way that his style of evading does not prevent him from perceiving what the therapist is trying to communicate to him. Therefore, when a confrontation statement "works"--and you can see that logically it would not always work, since the therapist, having freedom of choice, can therefore make mistakes--the patient gets "an experience, not just an interpretation," as Fromm-Reichmann so aptly puts it. In our opinion this experience intensifies the transactional process taking place between the patient and the therapist. It does this in two somewhat contradictory ways. It focuses the patient's attention on his distortions, while at the same time making him aware that he is being understood and supported in the anxiety-provoking business of trying to face his evasions and rationalizations and to arrive at a more adaptive and satisfying, possibly even creative mode of existence. It avoids the excessive passivity of some kinds of psychotherapy, which tacitly condone the patient's evasion of his awareness of freedom of choice, and the misguided activity of other kinds of psychotherapy, which make too many therapist-centered and directive interventions.¹⁷

Confrontation, when practiced with this skillful balance, says Glasser, has a way of creating in the one confronted the need for and possibility of change. In

¹⁶Glasser, Address at . . . Claremont.

¹⁷Garner and Jeans, op. cit., p. 404.

order to understand Glasser's use of confrontation it is important to be aware of the specifics of his approach. The emphasis in confrontation is essentially twofold--on the present and on behavior.

The present: Glasser strongly emphasizes the here and now. While respecting the fact that the past contributes to what a person is now, Glasser focuses on the other incontrovertible fact that one cannot change the past, only the present. Also Glasser does not believe that unearthing the cause of past mistakes will necessarily prevent present or future ones.

Don't poke around in people's past. Don't get the whole, gruesome, miserable history. It is not necessary. It was tough enough for this man to live with this history without having to go through it again with you. Deal as much as you can with the present problem and work toward the future. Don't feel that you have to know the whole history from the time he was six months old. Work with the present problem. The man comes in and says, "I've got trouble." Ask him, "What is the trouble?" Find out what he is doing now which is contributing to that trouble--that is good enough. You don't have to find it all out. If you do, the person begins to feel in a certain sense discouraged by again telling it to you, and you will become discouraged. He will become involved with you in the terms of his past misery and you want him to change. So you want to avoid that as much as possible and give him the idea that regardless of how tough life has been in the past, it is possible to change. If he talks too much about his past he will feel he is stuck there and too many people want to come for counseling and guidance only to wallow around in the mud of their past and have the person moan and groan with them which doesn't do a bit of good and they don't change. So talk about people's present problems, work toward their future and I think you can counsel them much more effectively. If

If you have to know something about the past ask specifically about it and relate it to the present. If it can't be related to the present and what is going on now it is really of no importance . . . And if you want to find out where in the past he effectively fulfilled his needs--he made some kind of an identity--he operated satisfactorily--he related to people in a meaningful way which got him and them satisfaction--if you want to find this out, then ask about it. Find out when he was successful in the past. This is something you might work in helping him to become more successful in the present. But to find where he failed or was in misery will do no good whatsoever.¹⁸

Behavior: Behavior is the second emphasis in Glasser's use of confrontation. It would be best to hear in Glasser's own words why behavior is so important.

You must work with people's behavior and that means you can't deal successfully with their emotions or their feelings. You may have been taught in various counseling and guidance courses that to counsel or guide or do therapy adequately one has to be very sensitive to others. One has to communicate with them on a feeling level. You will find if you do this you are going to gain very little. You should spend your time talking to people about their behavior, for feelings accompany behavior, and feelings are for clarification. If a person behaves in a way to fulfill his needs, in a way in which he and you and the world considers relatively satisfactory, he has a pretty good chance of feeling good most of the time. He also can behave this way and not feel good. And that's the way it is. You have no way to tell another person how to feel good. We have no magic like that. It is up to them to discover a way of acting and it takes a responsible behavior. Even though behavior and feelings are intimately wrapped up, if you want to intervene psychologically, it is much better for you to do so, more satisfactory, in the area of behavior. Because if you are going to help a person change you've got to

¹⁸ Glasser, Address at . . . Claremont.

get his behavior out on the table where you can both examine it. You've got to get what he is doing right out where you can both examine it in some detail. And this is exactly what people try at all costs to avoid doing, because they know that if you do that they will realize that it was their choice and they might be able to make a better choice.¹⁹

The counselor who confronts a client directly about his behavior must have a strong ego, because the counselor is interrupting the client's blind pattern of acting out and must be prepared for a reaction against the counselor.

The importance of behavior in the confrontational approach has also been explored by James A. Knight in counseling with college students. In telling of a medical student whose performance and grades were not up to his capacity, Dr. Knight confronted him with the fact his behavior seemed to imply that he did not want to be a doctor if it meant paying the price in energy, discipline and organization of work. Although there could have been some hidden or unconscious determinant in the student's behavior, Knight writes:

I feel that this kind of student can be helped best by not letting him hide behind an emotional problem. He should be told very firmly but supportively to do his work or withdraw from school. This student, as well as many others, will accept this type of analysis of the problem and immediately move ahead in improved performance as well as some growth in personal maturity. A colleague of mine is even more blunt with such a student. After examining a student for some suspected emotional disorder to explain failure and on finding none, my colleague tells the student that he

¹⁹Ibid.

has "lead rheumatism." The student asks the nature of this illness. My colleague replies, "it is when the iron in the blood turns to lead and settles in the behind. The treatment of this personal illness of yours will be left to you. Our admonition to you is simple: Shape up or ship out."²⁰

That is close to Glasser's emphasis that behavior is of critical importance and that confrontation must focus on present behavior.

Howard J. Clinebell, Jr. has summarized Glasser's method of confrontation in six points:

1. Establish a relationship. This is the most difficult and crucial step.
2. Confront the person with the self-defeating nature of his reality-denying behavior. As Glasser puts it, "The therapist must reject the behavior which is unrealistic but still accept the patient and maintain his involvement with him."
3. Block the irresponsible, acting-out behavior.
4. Reward responsible behavior with approval.
5. Help the person learn to satisfy his needs in socially constructive, reality-oriented ways.
6. Explore his aspirations and help him make and implement realistic but satisfying plans for the future.²¹

From this list it is clear that the process of Reality Therapy does not end with confrontation.

²⁰James A. Knight, "Confrontation in Counseling with Special Emphasis on the Student Setting," Pastoral Psychology, XVI:159 (December 1965), 51.

²¹Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 237.

4. Help in Satisfying Needs

Once involvement has been established and confrontation about reality-denying behavior has occurred, the therapist must teach the person better ways to fulfill his needs. For Glasser this means three things: helping the person to make better choices, to make commitment, and to discipline himself.

Choices. Choices have to do with value judgments. Getting someone to make a value judgment on his own behavior automatically involves morality. Glasser makes no apology for this emphasis on morality which further separates him from main-line psychiatry. In this series of excerpts he makes his position quite clear:

A further important difference between Reality Therapy and conventional psychiatry concerns the place of morality, or to be more specific, the place of right and wrong in the process of therapy. Conventional psychiatry does not directly concern itself with the issue of right and wrong. Rather, it contends that once the patient is able to resolve his conflicts, and get over his mental illness, he will be able to behave correctly. We have found that this view is unrealistic. All society is based on morality, and if the important people in the patient's life, especially his therapist, do not discuss whether his behavior is right or wrong, reality cannot be brought home to him. It is unrealistic to ask a delinquent girl why she stole a car, why she is pregnant, why she smokes marijuana, hoping that once she discovers the reasons she will be able to resolve her conflicts and change her behavior. We believe that to stop her unsatisfactory behavior she must fulfill her needs, but that to fulfill her needs she must face the real world around her that includes standards of behavior

We believe that almost all behavior which leads to fulfilling our needs within the bounds of reality is right, or good, or moral behavior, according to the following definition: When a man acts in such a way that he gives and receives love, and feels worthwhile to himself and others, his behavior is right and moral

Where standards and values are not stressed, the most that therapy can accomplish is to help patients become more comfortable in their irresponsibility. Because our effort is always directed toward helping patients fulfill their needs, we insist on their striving to reach the highest possible standards

We are looking for neither conformity nor mediocrity in the guise of normal behavior. The most responsible men, such as Lincoln or Schweitzer, are those farthest from the norm. Our job is not to lessen the pain of irresponsible actions, but to increase the patient's strength so that he can bear the necessary pain of a full life as well as enjoy the rewards of a deeply responsible existence.²²

The way one goes about helping a person make a choice involving value judgment is outlined by Glasser:

You have to say to him, "Is this behavior helping you? Is this what you consider to be the right thing to do?" The right thing, the good thing, I don't care which you use, it is all the same. There is behavior which is good and there is behavior which is bad, and it is up to him to make a value judgment as to his behavior in the context of your counseling situation. I am assuming you have gotten this behavior out on the table where you can look at it. If he won't do that there is nothing that you can do for him. There is no possibility of helping him. Most people will do it. If, on the other hand, you get the behavior on the table and say, "Do you believe that this behavior is helping? Is this good? Is this the right thing?" And he looks it over and says, "Well, I think it is." Then we have to resist the immense temptation which I think we all have whether we are ministers or not, and

²²Glasser, Reality Therapy, pp. 56, 57, 59.

especially in your situation I think the temptation is even greater than mine, to say to him, "Buddy, you made the wrong choice." Because if we are going to be honest and give people a choice and tell them they have choices then we can't say to them when they make a choice which we are desperately trying to get them to make, "You made the wrong one," because then there is no choice at all. There are choices and the choice they make may not agree with that which we consider to be right, but we have to respect their choice. That is the only way they will change and they will test us out and check us and see if we are going to do this. Because they will make the wrong choice perhaps to see if we will then revert into our role of preacher and preach to them. Under these circumstances you don't do that. You say, "Well, that was your choice. Do you understand which choice you are making?" This is where reality comes in. Then you must discuss with them the reality of the choice they are making so that they understand their responsibility for the choice and the possible problems and the possible difficulties associated with that choice.²³

Commitment: Once a person has made a choice about his behavior, the next step is to get him to make a commitment that he can keep.

If you are counseling with an alcoholic and he says, "I am finally going to stop drinking. Drinking is no good for me. I am going to stop." Then you say, "Well, what commitment will you make to stop drinking?" The alcoholic will immediately make one if he is like most alcoholics I know,--he will say I will never take another drink as long as I live, which is making no commitment at all. Then you will say, "Can you remain sober tonight, or this afternoon, (depending on how well you know him)--or until you get home from here." Get some kind of a commitment so that he can fulfill his value judgment. That is the only way to make a change, that is if he sets up a commitment through a choice and then fulfills it. This gives him strength. This gives him motivation and gets him involved with you. Because when he goes

²³ Glasser, Address at . . . Claremont.

back to you he can say, "I have fulfilled my commitment. This is what I did. I said I wouldn't get drunk tonight and I didn't." So what you have to do, and this takes planning and understanding of people and experience in dealing with people--is help people toward making a commitment according to their value judgment that they can fulfill.²⁴

Discipline: Glasser places a strong emphasis on self-discipline as the way to live responsibly and thereby maintain self-esteem. But he notes self-discipline is not easily learned. Most people need help in learning it. Glasser proposes that the therapist as helper must act as the one who disciplines:

We must under no circumstances accept any excuse for behavior about which they have made a commitment. No excuse is acceptable for not fulfilling their commitment. This is discipline. Not listening to any excuse whatsoever. If the house burned down that is no excuse. If they broke both their legs that is no excuse for not getting to work--absolutely no excuse whatsoever. Commitment is a sacred thing. Make it small and reasonable and possible for them and then give no excuse whatsoever for failure to fulfill that commitment. Get them to commit themselves, make a new plan. Get them to make another value judgment but accept no excuse whatsoever. Let them not leave you until they have recommitted themselves. If they refuse to commit themselves, if they refuse to make a value judgment, if they want to depend upon an excuse, then there is no way you can help them. They are beyond the help of psycho-therapy as far as I am concerned. In most cases if you work powerfully and patiently and carefully, you will, after a period of time, begin to get people to understand that you care and that it is possible for them to take responsibility and fulfill their needs. And it is possible for them to fulfill commitments and through this they gain strength and motivation. They are able to live a more

²⁴Ibid.

successful life, and even hopefully a more happy life, but you certainly never put yourself in a position of guaranteeing this.²⁵

He asks for the kind of involvement that combines love and discipline in such a way that responsibility can be taught.

C. DANGERS AND STRENGTHS

1. Dangers:

That there are dangers in reality therapy is obvious. Even Glasser acknowledges this. Five are worth brief consideration.

Danger for the Therapist: As was mentioned earlier, the therapist who uses reality therapy must have a strong ego. The therapist becomes so involved personally with the client, that he opens himself up to all kinds of criticism and testing by the client. This will lead to direct encounters in which the therapist's weaknesses may be exposed. Unless he is prepared for this kind of relationship, the therapist should avoid reality therapy.

Danger when applied broadly: One general criticism is that reality therapy is most useful with character disorders, and that when applied to the full spectrum of

²⁵Ibid.

mental and emotional disorders, it is not so effective. Indeed much of Glasser's work has been done with persons with character disorder and in institutional settings where controls are more certain. He has not written as much about the application of reality therapy to private practice or to related disciplines like pastoral counseling. However this does not mean that reality therapy is not applicable to these other fields. It is just that generalizations must be cautious until Glasser or other qualified persons make the necessary extrapolations.

Danger of dependency: Hiltner and Colston point out that there is a danger in reality counseling that one can remove responsibility from the counselee by being too directive.²⁶ This places the burden of responsibility on the counselor, which is where many counselees would prefer it. When one is dealing with irresponsible or dependent persons, this danger is very real--especially when it is coupled with the danger that directive counseling may appeal to a counselor who enjoys having others depend on him.

²⁶ Seward Hiltner and Lowell G. Colston, The Context of Pastoral Counseling (New York: Abingdon Press, 1961), p. 51.

Danger of Superficiality. Oden quite rightly cites Freud in acknowledging this danger:

Freud significantly distinguishes his own treatment from guidance therapy or "treatment by suggestion," which "achieves nothing toward the discovery of the patient's unconscious; it makes him less able than ever to overcome the deeper resistances, and in the more severe cases it invariably fails on account of the insatiability it rouses in the patient, who then tries to reverse the situation, finding the analysis of the physician more interesting than his own." He emphasized that "Therapeutic efficacy does not lie in the suggestive prohibitive command of the physician," but in the fact that symptoms automatically disappear when they are, through free association and transference, redirected from their original course of symptom formation.²⁷

Danger of moralism and its accompanying authoritarianism: It is very easy for confrontation to be used inappropriately. Knight comments that:

Pastors and teachers have not always understood the meaning of confrontation in counseling. It is often confused with a vertical type of authoritarianism, moralistic preachments, or hostile attacks indulged in under the guise of "Righteous indignation."²⁸

Such confrontation is destructive of relationship because it engenders guilt, hostility and rejection in the recipient. But such confrontation is not the kind Glasser espouses in reality therapy.

²⁷Oden, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

²⁸Knight, op. cit., p. 49.

2. Strengths:

The dangers of reality therapy are balanced by some significant strengths. Eight are briefly considered below.

Strength of the non-medical model: In divorcing therapy from the medical model of mental illness together with its emphasis on diagnosis, Glasser eliminates a de-humanizing factor in the treatment of persons. The person who has trouble relating to himself and others is treated as a human being who needs the loving concern of another human being. The doctor-patient relationship which implies that the patient is "sick" is dispensed with in favor of a relationship in which two persons meet in a very human way to find a better way for the troubled one to relate.

Strength of a supportive relationship: Reality therapy provides a strong, supportive relationship for persons who are weak or uncertain and need the involved and sustained help of another mature person. Glasser is well aware of the dangers of dependency and sets as a goal the gradual weaning of the person from his dependency by helping him learn self-discipline.

Strength of direct intervention: Through involved confrontation reality therapy provides a method of intervention that can enable the therapist to interrupt a negative, self-feeding cycle relatively quickly. This is particularly helpful in crisis situations where time is critical. For although involvement does take some time to establish, it requires far less time than the more traditional approaches including the non-directive as well as the psychoanalytic. Along this same line, reality therapy is relatively short-term when compared with other therapeutic approaches.

Strength of the "here and now" approach: Glasser's refusal to dwell on the person's past has the advantage of short-circuiting lengthy excursions in a search of causes of a person's trouble. By focusing on present behavior Glasser not only saves time, but keeps the involvement direct and immediate. There is less interpretation and more experience.

Strength of an active approach: Glasser encourages an active involvement by the therapist, rather than the more passive role advocated by many schools of psychotherapy. This allows the therapist to react more fully as a human being, rather than as merely an active listener and reflector of feelings. It also gives the troubled person the feeling of real involvement with someone who

cares enough to risk himself more completely than is usually true in the doctor-patient relationship.

Strength of the interpsychic: Glasser's emphasis on involvement as contrasted with transference helps keep the relationship on a conscious and interpsychic level and thereby avoids the intrapsychic problems inherent in transference. This is a particular strength for pastoral counselors and others who are not equipped to undertake a thorough-going psychotherapeutic reconstruction.

Strength of the emphasis on freedom: Reality therapy is based on a belief that man is free to accept responsibility for his life, and that he is not completely determined by his unconscious or his past. He can make conscious decisions that effect real changes and liberate him from past mistakes. Reality therapy is therefore much more hopeful about man than some therapies.

Strength of the authoritative: In reality therapy the therapist operates from a position of authority which is not necessarily authoritarian. He must be a person who is obviously responsible in managing his own life in order to be qualified to help others learn to manage theirs. Though the therapist relates to the person in trouble as one human being to another, there is never any question who is the therapist. Some have accused Glasser of

functioning as a strong father figure for his clients. He would deny this transference terminology and insist that he was merely a person with ego strength trying to help persons learn to be responsible for themselves. And he is saved from the danger of the authoritarian by his insistence on involvement. Nevertheless his model of the therapist is a person who is authoritative. And this is a strategic point in the central problem of this dissertation--namely the authority of the minister.

D. APPLICATIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF THE MINISTER'S AUTHORITY

Reality therapy seems to be applicable to the problem of the minister's authority. That problem, briefly stated, is the conflict between the sustaining and confronting aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. In the last chapter it was suggested that the solution to this problem may lie in the direction of the minister's developing close involvement with his congregation, before, during, and after confrontation. In this chapter it has been seen that Glasser brings involvement and confrontation into a dynamic, working relationship.

There are strong similarities between the position of the therapist and the minister, because both have the task of confronting without breaking relationship. This

can be expressed in the language of reality therapy, as has already been done in this chapter. However, in relating reality therapy to this problem of the ministry, it will be helpful to see these applications in theological language as well.

Another way of saying that Glasser brings involvement and confrontation together would be to say that he unites grace and judgment, as well as grace and works. Involvement is achieved by the therapist (minister) being understanding and non-judgmental toward the client (parishioner). He accepts the client (parishioner) as a person first, no matter how confused or irresponsible he may be. This is a good secular description of Christian grace which is the acceptance of a person, not on the basis of his righteousness, but in the belief that he is a child of God and loved by God. Once the client (parishioner) accepts the acceptance of the therapist (minister), the therapist (minister) can speak a word of confrontation (judgment) about irresponsible behavior without threatening the relationship. However, to sustain the relationship, the client (parishioner) must give evidence from his side of more responsible behavior (good works).

In order to understand how reality therapy applies to the problem of this dissertation, it is important to examine in more detail both involvement as grace, and confrontation as judgment and the demand for works.

1. Involvement as grace

Involvement as grace can be seen in three emphases of reality therapy--love, the present, and relationship.

The emphasis on love: Glasser's emphasis on everyone's need to love at least one person and be loved by at least one person is central to the gospel. Without it, a person does not feel worthwhile. That is, he does not accept himself because he has not felt accepted by anyone else. Love, then, is basically an experience of involvement with another person, and the basic character of this involvement is one of gracious acceptance of each other.

The emphasis on the present: Glasser's emphasis on present behavior and his refusal to dwell on past mistakes is consonant with the Christian teaching about forgiveness. Christianity teaches we are graciously accepted as persons who are forgiven, provided only that we can accept that forgiveness and begin living more responsibly.

The emphasis on relationship: Glasser's insistence on close involvement with others as the only basis of a helping relationship is also central in Christianity's teaching about the nature of fellowship. The church is a community of love where forgiveness is practiced and

where a person finds acceptance of himself and the ability to accept others. Also it is in this atmosphere of acceptance that confrontation can take place, not only without breaking relationship, but often with a deepening of relationship. Certainly this is one of the chief goals of Christian community.

2. Confrontation as judgment and works

Confrontation as judgment and works is evident in reality therapy's emphasis on morality, on freedom, and on groups.

The emphasis on morality: Earlier it was pointed out that Glasser's emphasis on right and wrong behavior gives reality therapy a strong moral flavor. He assumes that a person has at least some moral standards, and that living below them causes him trouble with himself. Glasser also recognizes that society has standards too, and he helps clients to learn that they cannot ignore these standards without incurring problems with others. In confronting clients about their "bad" behavior he hopes to get them to inaugurate "good" behavior that will enable them to live up to their own and society's standards. It is important for the purposes of this dissertation to understand that such confrontation has a quality of moral judgment, and that the resultant good behavior is

very much like the biblical concept of "good works." At its best the Christian church has insisted that judgment (confrontation) take place in the context of grace (involvement), and that any good works that result be seen as the fruits of such gracious judgment.

The emphasis on freedom: Glasser insists that the client is free to choose how he will behave. This means he is responsible for his behavior and that only he can discipline himself and commit himself to a more responsible course. This is not only a healthy corrective to much determinism in certain schools of psychology, but it is consonant with the Christian teaching about man as a free moral agent who is responsible to himself and to God for his behavior.

The emphasis on the group: Glasser joins with Norman Iverson in discussing the applications of reality therapy to groups: "Large group therapy intensifies and widens interpersonal involvement, and by its nature enhances responsibility, thus fitting completely with reality therapy concepts."²⁹ They reached this conclusion after working with groups in both public schools and the Ventura Reception Center and Clinic at the Ventura School

²⁹William Glasser and Norman Iverson, Reality Therapy in Large Group Counseling (Los Angeles: Reality Press, 1966).

for Girls. This is an explicit acknowledgment of the importance of groups and indicates reality therapy's principles may be applicable to groups within the church as well as to the church itself as a community.

E. SUMMARY

This chapter has been devoted to an examination of Reality Therapy as a possible solution to the particular problem of the authority of the minister raised in this dissertation--namely the conflict between the confronting and sustaining aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. The above discussion indicates that there are significant implications for the solution of this problem, particularly in Glasser's dynamic linking of involvement and confrontation. A more specific consideration of the application of this principle to preaching will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

APPLICATIONS TO ONE PARISH

The purpose of this chapter is to describe a research project carried out in the author's congregation to test the thesis of this dissertation. The thesis is that if William Glasser is correct, then the closer the relationship between the minister and his parishioners, the greater the chance that confrontation through the sermon will not cause a decrease in respect for his authority as seen in evaluations of his leadership. Rather it may tend to increase respect for the minister as leader.

The testing was done using three different groups of persons from the author's congregation who acted as reactors to a series of four sermons. Their reactions were measured by three different devices. Let us consider each of the three components in this research--the groups, the sermon series, and the tests--before we consider the results.

A. THE THREE GROUPS

Three groups were used. The purpose was to have groups of differing levels of involvement with the minister who would deliver the sermons, so as to see whether

level of involvement was related to response to confrontation.

1. Group I

Group I was made up of four couples representing eight members of one of the "Dialogue" groups in the church. The preacher had been the leader of this group for over one year, and had had a close relationship with them. They were the oldest group, ranging in age from the early forties to the early fifties with an average age of forty-five, and were the closest in age to the minister. They represented the highest level of education of the three groups, all but one having bachelors degrees, and with three of the four men having advanced degrees. From the standpoint of involvement in the life and structure of the church, they held or have held more and higher offices than either of the other groups. Their participation in the research was the poorest of the three groups. Out of fourteen in this Dialogue Group of seven couples, four couples volunteered to help. Of the volunteers, one group member missed two out of forty-eight possible tests for a participation by the volunteers of over ninety-five per cent. The group was enlisted by the minister when he explained that he was looking for a group like those in the Dialogue Group to be reactors in this research project.

He was very careful to avoid divulging the nature of the research to all three groups.

The hypothesis concerning Group I is that because they have the most involvement with the minister of the three groups, they will rate his leadership highest. It is predicted that there will be a rise in their evaluation of his leadership after confrontation, and more favorable reaction to confronting sermons than by the other two groups.

2. Group II

Group II was made up of four couples from another "Dialogue" group in the congregation. The preacher had been the leader of this group for only four months, but in this time had begun to develop a close involvement marked by an unusual openness. Group II was also the youngest, ranging from the middle twenties to the early thirties, for an average of twenty-five. Six of the eight had bachelors degrees, which placed them educationally between Groups I and III. From the standpoint of church involvement, several held lesser offices, which places them considerably below Group I and about on a par with Group III. Their percentage of participation in the research was the highest of the three groups at one hundred per cent. And they too were enlisted by the minister's explaining to them his need for a group like them to participate in this

research. The entire group of four couples volunteered.

The hypothesis about Group II is that because they have considerably more involvement with the minister than the average member of the congregation, though less than Group I, they will give the second highest rating of his leadership. As with Group I a rise in their evaluation is predicted after confrontation. It is also predicted that they will give the second most favorable reaction to confronting sermons.

3. Group III

Group III was made up of twenty-two persons selected from among the active members of the congregation. A letter was sent to every fourth person on an alphabetical list of persons who had attended church in the past two months, inviting them to be a reactor. A sample of the letter sent is found in Appendix A. Twelve who volunteered were men and ten were women. This group's involvement with the minister was average for active parishioners, but lower than that of either Group I or II. The range of ages was from the mid-twenties to the late sixties, and was broader than that of either of the other two groups with an average age of forty-four. The education level was lower than that of the other groups with nine bachelors degrees and one advanced degree out of twenty-two persons. Their level of church involvement was

average, with several holding or having held important offices in the church, but more like Group II than Group I. Their percentage of participation in the testing was second only to Group II with over ninety-eight per cent participation. Two persons missed one test each out of twenty-two persons taking six tests each.

The hypothesis about Group III is that because they have had considerably less involvement with the minister than Groups I and II, it is predicted that their evaluation of the minister's leadership will be lower than that of Groups I and II. Also there will be less rise in their evaluations after confrontation than in those of the other two groups. It is also predicted that they will give the least favorable reaction to confronting sermons.

B. THE SERMON SERIES

The second component in this research was the sermon series. Four sermons were preached to which all three groups were asked to react. The initial problem was to determine what topics would be confronting to the congregation. This was accomplished by the use of a questionnaire devised in conjunction with the church's Commission on Christian Social Concerns and presented to the worshippers on two consecutive Sunday mornings. The questionnaire is found in Appendix B. There is, of course, the danger that in such a questionnaire the congregation

might tend to select topics they feel more comfortable about or less in need of being confronted with in sermons. However in the case of this questionnaire, all the subjects were potentially confronting. Also, the questionnaire did not indicate that the results were to be used as a suggestion for sermon topics. Actually the questionnaire asked the congregant to rate, in order of relative concern, the 5 most important social problems in our society, from a suggested list of twelve. A total of 396 people responded with only 16 being disqualified because of incorrectly filling out the questionnaire. Of the replies tabulated, 256 were from members, 94 were from non-members, and 40 gave no indication of their membership status. From the results the following five areas were identified as being of greatest concern to the congregation, member and non-member alike:

1. The war in Vietnam
2. Lack of respect for authority
3. Race relations
4. Illegal use of narcotics
5. Communism

The full text of this report to the congregation is found in Appendix C.

Once this was determined, the next decision concerned how best to structure the series. It was decided that the best way to get a contrasting reading from the confronting type of sermon was to alternate each of a confronting nature with one containing considerably less

confronting material, similar to the research done by Edgar N. Jackson.¹ These less confronting sermons, while not repressive-inspirational in Jackson's use of this phrase, were nevertheless designed to be more supportive and sustaining than inquiring and searching. This meant that the series of four sermons would have one less confronting sermon, followed by a more confronting sermon, followed by a less confronting sermon, followed by a more confronting sermon. It was felt that four very confronting sermons on four consecutive Sundays would be more than most congregations could handle without building up undue hostilities. Therefore the two concerns that came out highest on the questionnaire response were used--the war in Vietnam, and lack of respect for authority--and were alternated with two less confronting subjects. The series as preached was in the following order:

1. Conquering Loneliness
2. Having Authority Worthy of Respect
3. Bringing Good Out of Evil
4. A Pastor Ponders Vietnam

The text of these sermons is found in Appendices I through L.

¹Edgar N. Jackson, A Psychology For Preaching (Great Neck: Channel Press, 1961), p. 49.

C. THE TESTING INSTRUMENTS

1. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII was developed by the Department of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University. Its purpose is to measure specific attributes descriptive of leader behavior. The questionnaire is designed to describe "how a leader goes about leading," and was developed for use in obtaining descriptions of a supervisor by the group member whom he supervises. It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group. In fact, the questionnaire has been used in such diverse settings as schools, an army airborne division, a state highway patrol organization, industrial organizations, governmental organizations, as well as with community leaders, union officers, United States Senators, corporation presidents and ministers. (1) For this last study the word "leader" was changed to "minister" and the word "superiors" to "denominational officials." No other adaptations were necessary.

The questionnaire attempts to measure eleven attributes of leadership. These are found in eleven subscales

composed of either five or ten items each. A subscale is defined by its component items, and represents a rather complex pattern of behaviors. Brief descriptions of the subscales are listed below:

Representation - 5 items reflecting the leader acting spokesman and representative of the group.

Demand Reconciliation - 5 items describing the leader handling complex and chaotic problems of detail and demand.

Tolerance of Uncertainty - 10 items indicating ways in which the leader responds to uncertainty and defeat in relation to group process and decision making.

Persuasion - 10 items portraying the persuasiveness, inspiration and skillfulness of the leader in expressing his point of view.

Initiation of Structure - 10 items describing leader performance concerned with defining his role and structuring members' expectations.

Tolerance of Member Freedom - 10 items indicating how the leader allows and encourages member freedom and initiative in work assignments.

Role Assumption - 10 items pointing toward leader competence in taking initiative and necessary action, as well as maintaining his leadership position.

Consideration - 10 items reflecting behavior concerned with the well-being and comfort of group members, as well as with an equalitarian respect for their contribution.

Production Emphasis - 10 items emphasizing the encouragement and pressure of the leader on the group to get work done.

Predictive Accuracy - 5 items indicating the leader's ability to sense accurately what is happening and what will likely happen.

Integration - 5 items describing the manner in which the leader keeps the group working together as a unit.²

Each of the 100 items in this questionnaire is responded to by indicating one of five possible responses from "always" to "never." A score ranges from 1 to 5 for negatively stated items and from 5 to 1 for positively stated items. A copy of the full Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire is found in Appendix D. A copy of the record sheet for scoring the questionnaire is found in Appendix E.

This instrument was administered to all three groups twice--once before the sermon series began, and once after the series was completed. This provided an opportunity to compare group responses before and after, as well as differences among groups.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was selected as the major testing device in this research project, not only because it is a standardized test, but because it provides a measurement of leadership. Earlier, leadership and authority were established as being closely related. Authority was defined as the power to influence

²Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII, An Experimental Revision (Columbus: Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University, 1963), p. 2.

the thought, opinion, and outward behavior of others--in short, the power to lead. For the purposes of this dissertation, the minister's authority was defined as his power or ability to give leadership. A device that measures leadership, therefore, can be useful in determining whether confrontation affects a minister's authority as measured by descriptions of his leadership before and after confrontation.

However, it is important to be certain just what the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire actually measures and how this relates to the thesis of the dissertation. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, who helped develop the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, characterize the instrument as describing what constitutes leadership rather than evaluating what leadership ought to be in order to be "good leadership."³ It is intended to be an observation of the leader's actual behavior. The instrument consists of items that describe behavior perceived as demonstrating leadership by persons who work under or with the leader. It is not intended that values of goodness or poorness be placed on the leader's behavior:

³ Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, eds., Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957), p. 2.

The papers of this monograph are thus largely concerned with methods of describing leader behavior, or at least the behavior of persons placed in positions of high leadership potential. Criteria of relative goodness or poorness are reported in some cases. However, within the framework of the studies these evaluations are not the major consideration.⁴

Nevertheless evaluations are implied in the results of the questionnaire, as was shown by John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons.⁵ In a section dealing with relations between leader behavior description dimensions and evaluation of leadership quality, they used two measures of leadership quality and compared the results with those of the Leader Behavior Description.

Significant correlations are found between descriptions of leader behavior and specific evaluations of the same behavior for each of the ten dimensions when subordinates do the describing and rating.⁶

The correlations are positive in all but one dimension, with the only negative correlation coming in descriptions of Production Emphasis. Apparently "leaders less concerned with production achieved the best rating."⁷

The implication is that the descriptions in the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire can be considered evaluations as well as descriptions for the purposes

⁴Ibid., p. 2.

⁵John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," in Ibid., pp. 6-38.

⁶Ibid., p. 30.

⁷Ibid., p. 31.

of this dissertation. With the clear understanding that there are no norms, it will be assumed that high ratings on the subscales (with the exception of subscale 9) are an index of approval of the leadership of the minister. Therefore, if the test results show that the minister is perceived as demonstrating leader behaviors after confrontation, his perceived authority has not been diminished by the confrontation in the sermons--leadership and authority being closely related. If the rating goes up after confrontation, then it is inferred that his authority is enhanced.

2. Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire

The purpose of this testing device is to measure what is communicated by the preacher while preaching. It attempts to measure two different things--feelings and ideas. It was adapted for this dissertation from a questionnaire developed by James T. Hall.⁸

Hall was trying to measure the "feeling tone" communicated by the preacher during worship, but was not interested in measuring the communication of ideas. He devised a questionnaire of twenty items, eight of them

⁸James T. Hall, "Measuring the Communication of Feeling During Worship," Pastoral Psychology, XIV:137 (October 1963), 50-55.

"emotional" and twelve "filler" questions. The test was administered to all the members of two rural churches he served in North Carolina immediately after the services. The negative reaction of the congregation was tabulated for each question in percentages. For example, question 15 measures conceit: "Did you feel that the minister acted superior to (was looking down on) the congregation?" Yes____ Some____ A little____ No____. If fifteen persons out of a congregation of sixty-five checked in either of the first three spaces, fifteen out of sixty-five, or 23 per cent would be registering some conceit communicated by the minister.

Hall came to four conclusions as a result of this testing. First, he discovered that preaching communicates on a feeling level perhaps more than we appreciate, part of the communication being unconscious. Second, the minister communicates not one, but two messages, and the messages may differ. He may communicate one message verbally and an entirely different message non-verbally. Third, the fact that congregations register feeling tones of the minister within themselves demands the ministry's concern in this important area of non-verbal communication. And fourth, the feeling tones which a minister communicates are related to his emotional involvement with the subject material.

In adapting this test it was decided to enlarge its scope to include a measurement of the communication of ideas as well as feelings. The original test included four positive feeling tones--understanding, reverence, sincerity, and joy--as well as four negative feeling tones--hostility, conceit, inferiority, and anxiety. To these were added three more. Two were positive--strength and inspiration. One was negative--destructiveness. This makes a total of eleven questions on ideas and content--information, openness, growth, clarity, tolerance, theology, impact and worthwhileness.

For a clearer picture of this questionnaire, see Appendix F. The questions are as follows:

(1) Do you think you have a better grasp now of the subject dealt with in the sermon? -- This is an idea item that deals with how informative the sermon was.

(2) Do you feel your faith is stronger because of the sermon? -- This positive feeling item determines if the preacher communicated strength.

(3) Do you find your ideas were changed by the sermon? -- This idea item focuses on whether the preacher encourages growth in his people.

(4) Do you feel that the minister had your interests at heart during the sermon? -- This positive feeling item asks if the preacher seemed understanding.

(5) Would you like to discuss the sermon with the minister? -- This idea item tries to discover if the minister conveyed openness.

(6) Did the minister show a reverent attitude during the service? -- This positive feeling item tries to measure the presence of reverence in the preacher.

(7) Do you think the sermon was easy to understand? -- This idea item checks for clarity in the idea content and presentation.

(8) Do you feel that the minister was sincere during the sermon? -- This positive feeling item seeks for sincerity.

(9) Do you have a better appreciation for the minister's point of view now? -- This idea item seeks to see if the minister presented his ideas so that an atmosphere of tolerance was present.

(10) Do you feel moved to do something because of the sermon? -- This positive feeling item tries to see if the preacher was able to inspire his listeners.

(11) Did the minister show a spirit of gladness during the sermon? -- This positive feeling item measures whether the preacher conveyed joy.

(12) Do you find this sermon "Christian" as you understand it? -- This idea item checks to see if the preacher was even moderately theological or religious in his presentation.

(13) Did the minister seem irritated at the congregation during the sermon? -- This negative feeling item measures the presence or absence of hostility.

(14) Can you remember any idea presented in the sermon? -- This idea item attempts to see if the sermon had any intellectual impact.

(15) Do you feel the minister acted superior to (was "looking down on") the congregation? -- This negative feeling item seeks to learn if the preacher showed conceit.

(16) Are you shaken in your faith by the sermon? -- This negative feeling item indicates the presence of destructiveness in the attitude or approach of the preacher.

(17) Did the minister show a lack of confidence during the sermon? -- This negative feeling item shows a sense of inferiority on the part of the preacher.

(18) Do you think it was worth your time to hear the sermon? -- This idea item reveals a sense of worthwhileness conveyed by the preacher.

(19) Was the minister tense during the sermon? --
This negative feeling item measures the presence of anxiety.

This questionnaire was administered to all group members immediately after hearing each of the four sermons. It gave an opportunity to compare group response to the two confrontational sermons.

The Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire is an unsophisticated device when compared with a standardized test like the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. It attempts to get an impressionistic reading on the communication of ideas and feelings immediately after the hearing of a sermon. While lacking standardization and validation, it nevertheless does give some broad measurement.

It is important to be certain what it does attempt to measure and to see what bearing this has on the thesis. As is indicated in the title, this questionnaire attempts to measure the communication of ideas and feelings by the minister to the congregation, with a high percentage in positive response categories, and a low percentage in negative response categories indicating that feelings were received favorably. Contrariwise, a low percentage in positive categories and a high percentage in negative response categories would indicate that feelings were received unfavorably.

Therefore if the Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire test results show higher ratings by Groups I and II, to the confronting sermons, it may be inferred that this questionnaire provides a validation of part of the thesis of this dissertation--namely that confrontation after involvement will not cause rejection of what the minister says, and parenthetically, the way in which he says it.

Also it may be inferred that these results will provide a cross check, albeit unsophisticated, to the results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire that should show whether confrontation affects positively or negatively the evaluation of the minister's leadership and authority.

3. Feedback Response Measurement

Jackson speaks of the need to feel back during a sermon since there is no opportunity to talk back. This is one way in which there can be a kind of dialogue. He conducted an experiment in the church he served that measured "feedback" in two ways. He used trained observers in the congregation who reported the attentiveness and mood of the listeners during the sermon. Tape recordings of the sermons were used to determine the frequency of coughing. Jackson writes:

Coughing is about the only acceptable method available for members of the congregation to express displeasure, defense or rejection. Perhaps it is done unconsciously, as a rejection of discomfort and irritation. Perhaps it is consciously done as a type of noise that temporarily blots out the words that are uncomfortable. The season of the year was the same for both types of sermons, but the mood of discomfort and rejections was revealed by much more coughing during the analytical than during the repressive-inspirational sermons.⁹

Out of this experiment a third reaction device was developed for this dissertation. An observer¹⁰ seated in the congregation, recorded minute by minute coughs, nose blowings and throat clearings. The results of these observations are found in Appendix I with the full text of the four sermons transcribed from tapes made at the time of delivery, together with the minute by minute tabulations of feedback. A study of these results should show, if Jackson's experience is replicated, that the more confrontational kind of sermon evokes more feedback in the form of coughs, etc. It would also be interesting to note what material in the individual sermons causes the most feedback. And if there is a higher rate of coughing in the more confrontational sermons, it would suggest that they are indeed more confronting.

⁹Jackson, op. cit., pp. 57-58.

¹⁰The observer is a graduate student in psychology with much experience in group work and sensitive to subtle changes in group behavior.

CHAPTER V

RESEARCH RESULTS

The research results will be presented in this chapter, together with an exploration of how these results support or fail to support the hypotheses postulated in the last chapter.

A. LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire are found in Table I and Table II. The subscale values are expressed in the form of means for each of the three groups. These means were arrived at by summing the scores for each group on each subscale and then dividing that total by the number of persons in each group.

The results show that there are variations among the three groups on the mean subscale values. This indicates that the three groups view their minister differently--which supports part of the thesis that the level and quality of involvement between the minister and his parishioners does have an effect upon the way they view their minister.

In comparing the overall ratings of the three groups we find first that Group I rated the minister lowest overall. Eight out of twelve subscales were lowest in

TABLE I

LBDQ₁ (NOVEMBER)
MEAN SUBSCALE VALUES

	Group I	Group II	Group III
1. Representation	19.250	19.125	20.318
2. Demand Reconciliation	18.625	21.750	19.409
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty	33.000	32.875	33.091
4. Persuasiveness	42.750	44.625	42.864
5. Initiation of Structure	38.375	39.125	40.818
6. Tolerance of Freedom	34.875	41.125	40.091
7. Role Assumption	37.750	40.375	40.273
8. Consideration	37.000	40.256	39.864
9. Production Emphasis	31.625	38.625	37.273
10. Predictive Accuracy	19.000	20.375	18.909
11. Integration	17.000	19.625	20.318
12. Superior Orientation	33.625	38.875	39.500
	N = 8	N = 8	N = 22

TABLE II

LBDQ₂ (DECEMBER)
MEAN SUBSCALE VALUES

	Group I	Group II	Group III
1. Representation	19.750	20.625	21.136
2. Demand Reconciliation	18.125	22.125	19.318
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty	31.750	36.125	33.455
4. Persuasiveness	44.250	47.750	42.773
5. Initiation of Structure	39.125	41.000	41.091
6. Tolerance of Freedom	35.625	43.125	40.682
7. Role Assumption	38.500	42.000	40.409
8. Consideration	36.875	42.125	40.136
9. Production Emphasis	34.000	39.250	36.136
10. Predictive Accuracy	18.125	20.375	18.896
11. Integration	18.375	21.625	20.182
12. Superior Orientation	37.125	40.250	38.636
	N = 8	N = 8	N = 22

the November test; three subscales fell between the ratings of Group II and Group III; and one exceeded the other groups. In the December test Group I rated the minister lowest in ten out of twelve subscales, in the middle on one, and highest on one.

Second, we find that Group II rated the minister highest overall in the November test, highest on six out of twelve subscales, in the middle on three, and lowest on three. In the December test, nine out of twelve were highest for Group II, two were in the middle, and one was lowest.

Third, we see that Group III rated the minister in the middle overall. The November test shows six out of twelve subscales in the middle comparative rating, with four in the highest and two in the lowest. In December their ratings on nine out of twelve subscales fell between those of the other groups, and two exceeded and one was lower than those of the other groups.

Comparisons between the ratings in November and December for each group show a general movement upward in Groups I and II. Group I moved up in seven subscale ratings and down in five. Group II moved up in ten, down in one, and stayed the same in one. Group III moved up in six and down in six subscales. Perhaps this merely reflects the fact of growing interest in the project. On

the other hand it may suggest that involvement, even if it only be in a research project such as this, improves the relationship between the minister and members of his congregation involved in the project.

1. Exploring the Results

These results raise a number of questions as to why Group I rated the minister lowest, Group II highest, with Group III in the middle. Let us consider each of these in turn.

The hypothesis concerning Group I, as it applies to this questionnaire, was that because they had the most involvement with the minister, they would rate his leadership highest. Also it was predicted that there would be a rise in their evaluation of his leadership after confrontation. The results fail to support the first part of the hypothesis, but support the second part. That is, while Group I rated the minister's leadership lowest both before and after confrontation, there was a general rise in their rating in the testing following confrontation. Some of the possible explanations for these results are as follows:

(1) It is possible that the close involvement between the minister and Group I actually facilitated a kind of two-way confrontation not anticipated in the

hypothesis. From the minister's side, the confrontation in the sermons was facilitated to the extent that it did not cause a lowering in their evaluation of his leadership, as can be seen in the higher evaluations by Group I in the test scores after confrontation. The second part of the hypothesis predicted this. However from the group's side, the close involvement may have enabled them to be more confronting in their evaluations of his leadership, as suggested by the lower overall evaluations compared with the other two groups' evaluation both before and after confrontation in the sermons. If this is the case, then the hypothesis failed to take into consideration this two-sided aspect of confrontation.

(2) It is also possible that the close relationship between this group and the minister gave them greater insight into his leadership including weaknesses as well as strengths. This, however, was not without its problems for the members of the group. Of the three groups, only the members of this group complained about the difficulty of answering many of the questions because they said they knew the minister in so many different relationships that they did not know how to answer. While this may be viewed as something of a limiting factor, it nevertheless may have added to the accuracy of their evaluations of his leadership in both its negative and positive aspects.

(3) Age and station may possibly have been important factors. As the closest in age and status to the minister, this group was more of a peer group to him than the other two. He was seen and treated, for the most part, not as an authority figure, but more as another professional friend with many of the same problems and perspectives as themselves. This, too, would tend to give them insights into his leadership that the other groups might not have because of their different age and station, and might make them more willing to risk themselves in giving negative evaluations of his leadership.

(4) Education may also have been a factor. As the group with the highest educational level, they might therefore be inclined to be more analytical in their responses and judgments. Being from the professional-managerial class, they might be expected to be more accustomed to making critical evaluations of persons. This might in turn help explain their generally lower evaluations of the minister's leadership.

(5) One possible negative factor was that Group I represented the "establishment" of the local church in that all either held or had held high positions of church leadership. This caused the minister to feel a certain restraint to his own openness. Nevertheless he was able to exhibit some openness with them in expressing a limited

number of negative feelings and ideas about the church. This might have interacted with their greater investment in the church to cause them to respond more negatively in the questionnaire.

(6) One other possible factor that caused Group I to come out lowest in their evaluations of the minister's leadership appeared in a review of the individual scores of members. It was discovered that three individuals were consistently much lower in their evaluations than the other five members of the group. These three brought the overall subscale mean values down, and may indicate factors that are impossible to isolate.

In brief it seems that while close involvement does not necessarily result in higher evaluations of a minister's leadership, it may actually facilitate a kind of two-way confrontation--the minister confronting his congregation without lowering their evaluation of his leadership, and the congregant risking confronting the minister on the less favorable aspects of his leadership, without breaking relationship. At this point it is impossible to tell whether this is due to greater involvement alone, or whether it is due in part to the fact that Group I perceived the minister as a peer.

The hypothesis concerning Group II, as it applies to this questionnaire, was that because they had

considerably more involvement with the minister than the average member of the congregation, though less than Group I, they should give the second highest rating of his leadership. As with Group I, a rise in their evaluation after confrontation was also predicted. The results do not fully support the first part of the hypothesis, in that Group II rated the minister highest of the three groups. There is partial support, however, in that Group II rated the minister higher than Group III, as predicted. The second part of the hypothesis concerning a rise in evaluation after confrontation was supported by the results, with Group II moving up in eleven out of twelve categories for the greatest rise of the three groups. Some of the possible explanations for these results are as follows:

(1) The minister felt far more open to expressing his real feelings and ideas with this group than with Group I. Perhaps this was because they did not represent the "establishment." He was far more open with them than with any other group in the church. At the same time Group II members seemed to be much more open to expressing their own feelings and ideas in the group. Being less involved in the structures of the church, they had much less of themselves invested, and were therefore more relaxed about the minister's expression of his negative ideas and

feelings about the church. This openness on both sides would tend to allow the group to see the minister's leadership in a more favorable light, and may be one factor in the higher evaluations.

(2) Another possible factor is that while the relationship between the minister and members of Group II was good in the sense of being open and accepting, it was nonetheless more limited in some ways than that with Group I. The chief relationship Group II had with the minister other than as worshippers on Sunday was as members of a Dialogue Group of which he was leader. So they had little or none of the conflict expressed by Group I in answering the questions because of Group I's many different relationships with the minister beyond preaching and leading their group. While this may be considered something of a limiting factor in Group II's evaluation of his overall leadership, it may help to explain their higher evaluations as arising from the openness of the only relationship they had with the minister outside the Sunday morning service.

(3) A third possible factor in helping explain why Group II evaluated the minister's leadership highest was the possibility that he was something of an authority figure to them with regard to age and station. He was both older and well established in his vocation, while this

youngest of the three groups was comprised of couples just starting their families and careers. To them the minister may have seemed a "father figure," particularly in light of the fact that three of the eight members of the group had previously turned to him for counseling. Only one in Group I and one in Group III had done so. Therefore Group II might be expected to accept his leadership more readily and uncritically than both Groups I and III, who were closer to him in age. This could help explain not only the higher evaluations of Group II, but also the importance of such factors as age and station in determining the quality of relationship.

(4) One other possible factor in the higher evaluation of Group II was the high degree of unanimity in their opinions. Unlike Group I where three individuals were consistently much lower in their evaluations and thereby lowered the group evaluations overall, an examination of the individual scores of members of Group II shows very small variation.

Although no conclusions are warranted, the key to Group II's responses may lie in the quality of the involvement. Their relationship with the minister was more open than Group I's. And while Group I related to the minister as a peer, Group II related to him more as a father figure.

The hypothesis concerning Group III, as it applies to this questionnaire, was that because they have had considerably less involvement with the minister than Groups I and II, their evaluation of his leadership would be lower than Groups I and II. Also there should be less rise in their evaluations of his leadership after confrontation than in those of the other two groups. The results do not fully support the first part of the hypothesis, in that Group III's ratings were between those of Groups I and II. However the hypothesis may be partially supported in that Group III's evaluations were at least lower than those of Group II. The second part of the hypothesis predicting less rise in their evaluations after confrontation was supported by the results.

Why were Group III's evaluations lower than those of Group II but higher than those of Group I? The following tentative explanation is offered to account for Group III's being in the middle, and for the ranking of all three groups.

(1) If Group I had the insight of peers of the minister, as well as close enough involvement to risk confronting him with the weaknesses of his leadership, they might be expected to be more critical and hence lower in their evaluations than the other two groups.

(2) If Group II related to the minister as an authority figure, this might tend to prevent their risking

confronting him on his leadership weaknesses. Hence they might be expected to be higher in their evaluations than the other two groups.

(3) And if Group III was closer to the median of the congregation at large with regard to age and station and education as well as involvement with the minister, and if they were less likely than Groups I and II to perceive him either as a peer or an authority figure, their evaluations might be expected to fall between those of Groups I and II.

However it must be stated again that these explanations are highly inferential and certainly not conclusive.

2. Conclusions

The general thesis of this research is that if Glasser is correct, then the closer the relationship between the minister and his parishioners, the greater the chance that confrontation through the sermon will not cause a decrease in respect for his authority as seen in evaluations of his leadership. Rather it may tend to increase respect for the minister as leader. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was used with the assumption that high ratings on the subscales are an index of approval of the leadership of the minister.

Three hypotheses were formulated to test this thesis. The results may be summarized as follows: It was predicted that Group I would evaluate the minister's leadership highest, Group II second highest, and Group III lowest both before and after confrontation. The results do not support the hypotheses since Group II was highest, Group III second highest, and Group I lowest. It was also predicted that Groups I and II would rise in their evaluations after confrontation, and that Group III would show less change upward. The results support the hypotheses on this prediction.

It is important to state that the research results are inconclusive, so far as sustaining the general thesis is concerned. The number of unknown and uncontrolled variables are too great for the results to be in any way definitive. However, they are suggestive of support for the following reasons:

(1) The groups did vary in the way they view the minister, depending on the levels and quality of involvement, in accord with the thesis.

(2) The differences in the research results between Groups I and II may perhaps be due to the uncontrolled variables indicated by the phrase "the level and quality of involvement" which covers such factors as degree of openness, age, station, education, and

leadership positions in the church. Such variations could invalidate the specific hypotheses about the relative rankings of the three groups without invalidating the general thesis that relationship can facilitate confrontation.

(3) In general, the upward shift in the subscale ratings of Groups I and II from November to December would seem to support the thesis that involvement, even if it be only in a project like this one, can enhance respect for the minister's authority as seen in the rise in evaluations of his leadership. Also the fact that Group III's evaluation of the minister's leadership did not decline from November to December, indicates his perceived authority was not diminished by the confrontation in the sermons.

B. FEELING AND IDEA COMMUNICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The results of the Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire are found in Tables III and IV and in Appendices G and H. Tables III and IV give the results of the questionnaire administered following the two confrontational sermons. Since the hypotheses concern only the ratings of the two confrontational sermons, these are the only tables included in the text. The results of the questionnaires administered after the two repressive-inspirational sermons are included in the Appendix.

For purposes of simplification the results in Table III are in percentages. This made it easier to compare the three groups' reactions to each question on the questionnaire. Also, although there are four possible responses to each question--yes, some, a little, or no--the first three responses have been combined (yes, some, a little) into one positive percentage, with the "no" response as the one negative percentage. To have reproduced all the statistical data available would have lengthened the tables unduly and made comparison needlessly complex. Since there are both negative and positive feeling tones, a high percentage in positive response categories (Questions 1 through 12, 14, 18) and a low percentage in negative response categories (Questions 13, 15, 16, 17, 19) indicate that the feelings were received favorably. Contrariwise, a low percentage in positive response categories and a high percentage in negative response categories would indicate that the feelings were received unfavorably.

In order to compare the overall response of each group to each confrontational sermon it was necessary to get a mean percentage of favorable responses. This was done for each group by adding the percentage of favorable responses on each scale and dividing the sum by the number of scales. These mean percentages are found following question nineteen on each table.

The hypotheses concerning each of the three groups as related to this questionnaire are as follows:

The hypothesis about Group I is that they will rate the minister the highest of the three groups after confronting sermons.

The hypothesis about Group II is that they will rate the minister second highest of the three groups after confronting sermons.

The hypothesis about Group III is that they will rate the minister lowest of the three groups after confronting sermons.

Therefore if the Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire test results show higher favorable ratings by Groups I and II to the confronting sermons, it may be inferred that this questionnaire provides a validation of part of the thesis--namely that confrontation after involvement will not cause rejection of what the minister says and the way in which he says it. Also it may be inferred that such results will provide a cross-check to the results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire that have indicated that confrontation does not negatively affect evaluations of the minister's leadership.

The procedure will be to compare the responses of the three groups to each of the confronting sermons.

1. Sermon 2: A Confrontational Sermon Entitled "Having Authority Worthy of Respect."

This sermon was designed to confront the congregation on the matter of its attitude toward those who show lack of respect for law and authority, particularly toward rioters. It could be expected to cause a certain amount of discomfort among a congregation of cautious suburbanites. But if the hypotheses are sustained, those who have been more closely involved with the minister (Groups I and II) will be better able to accept the confrontation than those less involved (Group III).

Exploring the Results: The hypotheses are supported by the results reported in Table III on page 115. Group I rated the minister highest with a mean percentage of 84.9%, Group II second highest with 83.5%, and Group III lowest with 81.7%.

A close look at the results shows that Groups I and II were both higher than Group III in their reaction to the same seven questions--1, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14 and 18 that concern information, understanding, tolerance, inspiration, joy, impact, and worthiness. In addition Group I was highest in four other questions--3, 13, 16 and 19 that concern growth, hostility, destructiveness, and anxiety. And Group II was highest in four others--2, 7, 15 and 17 that concern strength, clarity, conceit, and inferiority.

This means that collectively Groups I and II were highest in their ratings of fifteen out of the total of nineteen questions. Group III on the other hand was lower in its ratings than either Group I or Group II. Seven of its ratings were in the middle--3, 7, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 19.

Since the results show more favorable responses by Groups I and II than Group III, it may be inferred that these results indicate a validation of the general thesis that confrontation after involvement will not cause rejection of what the minister says.

The suggestions for improving this sermon, as requested in question 20 of the questionnaire, were much more critical than for Sermon 1. (See Appendix G) Nine out of twenty-one comments were critical, with one somewhat hostile. They focused around two problems. Four commented that the sermon tried to encompass too much, and therefore lacked something in clarity. Five dealt with the need for some practical suggestions as to what can be done to reduce the lack of respect for authority. It is evident from these comments that the reactors were really participating as listeners. Many of the other comments were commendatory and encouraging to this kind of confrontational preaching. In short, Sermon 2 seemed to focus reactions sharply and for the most part positively.

TABLE III

SERMON 2 (NOVEMBER 19)

	Group I	Group II	Group III
1. Information			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.3
No			4.7
2. Strength			
Yes, some, a little	71.5	87.5	71.5
No	28.5	12.5	28.5
3. Growth			
Yes, some, a little	86	50	76.2
No	14	50	23.8
4. Understanding			
Yes, some, a little	71.5	75	86
No	28.5	25	14
5. Openness			
Yes, some, a little	71.5	75	86
No	28.5	25	14
6. Reverence			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
7. Clarity			
Yes, some, a little	71.5	100	95.3
No	28.5		4.7
8. Sincerity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
9. Tolerance			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.3
No			4.7

TABLE III (Continued)

10.	Inspiration			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	90.5
	No			9.5
11.	Joy			
	Yes, some, a little	86	75	62
	No	14	25	38
12.	Theology			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
	No			
13.	Hostility			
	Yes, some, a little	43	62.5	47.7
	No	57	37.5	52.3
14.	Impact			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	90.5
	No			9.5
15.	Conceit			
	Yes, some, a little	28.6	12.5	28.5
	No	71.4	87.5	71.5
16.	Destructiveness			
	Yes, some, a little	14.3	50	38.1
	No	85.7	50	61.9
17.	Inferiority			
	Yes, some, a little	43	12.5	24
	No	57	87.5	76
18.	Worthiness			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	90.5
	No			9.5
19.	Anxiety			
	Yes, some, a little	43	62.5	57.2
	No	<u>57</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>42.8</u>
Mean % of positive response		84.9	83.5	81.7

TABLE III (Continued)

20. Suggestions

It was great!

More emphasis on "In His Steps."

It was excellent and well delivered.

I think you had 3 or 4 sermons here. Too much material covered to make one good resounding point.

More of the same. You make me proud to be a Christian.

Excellent topic, but too much to cover in one sermon. Good delivery.

I felt he had people with him at the end but it seemed too bad no reaction could come then--no constructive action. In some meetings it would have been time for a buzz session and planned action to result.

As crucial as this problem is to all who truly believe in Christian precepts--I think a more definite suggestion for action would have further enhanced a valuable sermon.

No improvement but I do agree the rats are becoming a greater problem.

Much food for thought.

Many sermons say too much too fast. We can partially grasp it, but it swamps us with too much. This to me was really relevant--this we need. I hope somebody (else) will weekend in Watts.

A great sermon!

I wanted to stand and ask you if you had an answer. What could we do that would mean something?

To say the solution to the problems presented lie in face to face personal contact seems inconsistent with laying blame for these same problems on Congress. It is my understanding that the rat control bill is now passed.

TABLE III (Continued)

Very "guts-ball" topic; keep this up and you'll "chip away" at my bigotry--please!!

Relating directly to the people in Burbank was good and should be done more often. I feel that people will understand better when they can readily place themselves in a situation.

A very difficult topic. An honest effort to say something in the time available.

No improvements. I was glad to hear at least one concrete suggestion as to what "we" can do to improve poverty and restore respect for authority. I think the majority of Christians feel something should be done, but what? And what can each individual do to help?

Some of us are not quite as affluent as the minister suggests, and have a difficult time just meeting our church pledge, let alone giving more money to the poor. This perhaps sounds selfish and callous--it is not written with this feeling.

This was excellent. I liked your taking position on responsibility, Congress, etc. The challenge sounds exciting.

I think the request to help poverty stricken people should be followed through.

I always try to outline, but this one was difficult.

2. Sermon 4: A Confrontational Sermon Entitled "A Pastor Ponders Viet Nam"

This was the more confronting of the two confrontational sermons in the series. The position the minister took was generally more liberal than that of the majority of his congregation. He advocated an end to the bombing and a general deceleration of the war, but without withdrawal of all of our armed forces. Normally in a community as conservative as the one in which this minister serves, such a position might be expected to produce some controversy.

Exploring the results: While the hypotheses are not unequivocally supported by the results in Table IV on page 122, they are generally supported. Groups I and II rated the minister overall with the same mean percentage of 90.7, while Group III's rating was 89.4. Therefore the ratings by Group I and II exceeded those by Group III in accord with the hypotheses, although Group I's ratings did not exceed those by Group II, as was predicted.

This sermon produced more unanimity than any of the four sermons, as reflected in both the personal responses of the congregation outside the three groups and the research results in Table IV. There was complete concurrence at 100% by all three groups on six questions--1, 4, 6, 8, 12 and 18 which cover information, understanding,

reverence, sincerity, theology, and worthiness. The high level of acceptance of this confronting material by Groups I and II came out in two other configurations. Four questions found Groups I and II concurring at 100%-- 7, 9, 10, and 14 which cover clarity, tolerance, inspiration, and impact. In addition three questions found Groups I and II higher than Group III, though not at the 100% level--2, 5, and 19 which include strength, openness, and anxiety. This would seem to give evidence supporting the thesis that Groups I and II can face confrontation better. For when one puts aside the six questions where there is complete concurrence by all three groups, one finds that Groups I and II are both higher than Group III in their ratings in seven of the remaining thirteen questions.

The high level of acceptance of this confronting material seems to be borne out by the comments in response to question 20 which asked for suggestions to improve the sermon. Only five out of twenty-two comments could be interpreted as in any way negative. For such a highly provocative subject, this is unusually small. However, these relatively few comments do not really reflect the acceptance this sermon received from the congregation. Many people went out of their way to comment favorably on the sermon to the minister. He was quite surprised by the

volume and warmth of the support he received, particularly since he was prepared for much more hostility and rejection.

TABLE IV

SERMON 4 (DECEMBER 3)

	Group I	Group II	Group III
1. Information			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
2. Strength			
Yes, some, a little	87.5	100	85.8
No	12.5		14.2
3. Growth			
Yes, some, a little	87.5	62.5	85.8
No	12.5	37.5	14.2
4. Understanding			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
5. Openness			
Yes, some, a little	75	100	71.5
No	25		28.5
6. Reverence			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
7. Clarity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.3
No			4.7
8. Sincerity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
9. Tolerance			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.3
No			4.7

TABLE IV (Continued)

10.	Inspiration			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.3
	No			4.7
11.	Joy			
	Yes, some, a little	87.5	75	90.5
	No	12.5	25	9.5
12.	Theology			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
	No			
13.	Hostility			
	Yes, some, a little	37.5	12.5	9.6
	No	62.5	87.5	90.4
14.	Impact			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	90.5
	No			9.5
15.	Conceit			
	Yes, some, a little		25	
	No	100	75	100
16.	Destructiveness			
	Yes, some, a little	37.5	25	24
	No	62.5	75	76
17.	Inferiority			
	Yes, some, a little	12.5	25	19.9
	No	87.5	75	80.1
18.	Worthiness			
	Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
	No			
19.	Anxiety			
	Yes, some, a little	25	25	57.2
	No	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>42.8</u>
Mean % of positive responses		90.7	90.7	89.4

TABLE IV (Continued)

20. Suggestions

Shout it from the hill tops.

Good sermon. Much food for thought.

It was great and just what many of us needed as laymen in a Christian church.

Excellent sermon.

Your sermon was one of the most rational, completely thought-out arguments I have heard on this subject. It is my general impression that most ministers present half reasoned emotional pleas. Not you.

Specifics of political and even social significance were more than adequate. I wanted more moral and spiritual emphasis.

I am afraid that I disagree with his 3 points on his stand toward the war (only an opinion not an improvement). I still am for escalating the war and ending it rather than continuing by draining our strength in coastal cities. Stop bombing--this allows the V.C. to really infiltrate. I disagree that we must have the conscience, reality, compassion, and hope in any war or we lose our goal of freedom.

One of the finest sermons I have ever heard. I am so glad to hear the church taking a stand on this war. It clarified my own thoughts and gave me ideas for new arguments against those who are in favor of war.

I am afraid I was one who felt we do have an obligation to stay in Viet Nam to battle the threat of communism. I sincerely feel we would after hearing the sermon, be better off to fight the war economically rather than with guns. Also educate rather than all the killing both on our side and on theirs. After all we are all God's children. This was the best sermon I have heard since the reaction group started. I felt (moved) more today than any other time. Thank you.

TABLE IV (Continued)

I like the idea of dealing with current problems through the sermon for in this way we can hopefully see and understand the Christian point of view and then move out to do something about it.

I think this was the strongest of the series.

It was excellent, as usual. Glad to hear your viewpoint clarified. This subject is so important for Christians to express themselves on.

Harry, you started out fine but didn't seem to have the courage to finish what you started. Viet Nam is not only a war of military might but is a war of the will of people (mankind) and the will of God.

The sermon truly has encouraged me to re-evaluate my thinking in terms of Christian responsibility.

I'm one who finds other things to think about--thanks for penetrating my lethargy.

I like to hear the current problems of our community and our nation discussed in the church.

This was such a big subject to cover in one sermon. Maybe another time an elaboration of his ideas on the political and economic aspect of the war might be due. I don't see our country as idealistic as Harry portrayed it. There should be no complaints from "the patriotic" on this sermon.

A good job with a very difficult subject.

Some times I expect less but you always give more, especially today.

This was a real cool appraisal of the situation.

Excellent sermon. This type needed more often.

A tremendous sermon.

3. Conclusions

It is important to keep in mind that the Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire is an unsophisticated instrument designed to give an impressionistic measurement of the minister's communication of ideas and feelings. Therefore the results are suggestive rather than conclusive.

In general the results seem to support the overall thesis that confrontation after involvement will not cause rejection of the minister, both in what he says and the way in which he says it. Also the results support the hypotheses about the three groups--namely, that Group I will rate the minister highest after the confronting sermons, Group II will rate him second highest, and Group III will rate him lowest. It may be inferred, moreover, that these results do provide a cross-check to the results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire that have indicated that confrontation does not negatively affect evaluations of the minister.

C. FEELBACK RESPONSE MEASUREMENT

The results of the Feelback Response Measurement are found in Appendix I. The text of all four sermons as delivered is reproduced there together with a minute-by-minute tabulation in the left margin of the number of

coughs, nose blowings, and throat clearings for each minute. These are totaled at the end of each sermon. They are as follows:

Sermon 1	-	126	coughs	-	5.0	avg. per minute
Sermon 2	-	214	coughs	-	7.6	avg. per minute
Sermon 3	-	146	coughs	-	6.0	avg. per minute
Sermon 4	-	237	coughs	-	8.4	avg. per minute

This count shows that Sermons 2 and 4 did indeed have considerably more coughs, etc. than Sermons 1 and 3. Of course this could indicate that Sermons 2 and 4 were duller and therefore evoked more protest in the forms of coughs. Or it could have been caused by a higher number of colds in the congregation on those two Sundays. However, the coincidence of this being so is highly unlikely. It seems reasonable to infer from the cough-count that Sermons 2 and 4 were indeed more confronting because they evoked more feedback in the form of coughs, etc.

A simple checking of the points at which the cough-count was highest in each of the sermons gives further evidence that the coughs, etc. do represent a response of anxiety, disagreement, or hostility. In Sermon 1 there were only three points at which the cough-count went to ten or above in one minute and in Sermon 3 there were only four. In Sermon 1 this occurred when the minister was discussing (a) the loneliness of working in a large company; (b) the various ways we dodge our essential loneliness through activity, drugs, sex; (c) the way one man

(Rupert Brooke) met a lonely situation. In Sermon 3 the cough-count rose above ten per minute when the minister was telling about (a) an accident he had in his car; (b) a woman who died a painful death with cancer; (c) Senator Robert A. Taft's courage in facing death from cancer; (d) Rudyard Kipling's loss of his son in World War I. All of these moments of high feedback in the two less confronting sermons come when anxiety producing material was being presented.

Sermons 2 and 4 had many more moments of high feedback. In Sermon 3 there were eight such moments when the cough-count went to ten or above per minute--(a) during a description of Jesus as one who got in trouble with the authorities; (b) during a description of Jesus as a disturber of the peace; (c) during a description of mob psychology; which covered two minutes; (d) the level of a police state; (e) a report of a local youth's reasons for not respecting police authority; (f) a prediction that the underprivileged will not stay in peaceful acquiescence forever; (g) a rundown of many biblical and historical religious figures who protested against unjust authority. Sermon 4 had ten minutes when the cough-count reached ten or more per minute:--(a) during a report on the death of one of the choir members in Viet Nam; (b) while stating that no young man of draft age is safe; (c) during a

quotation from President Johnson about the war; (d) while citing the growing concern and involvement of the clergy in discussion of the war; (e) while pointing out the right of conscientious objectors to object; (f) while outlining our war objectives; (g) during an acknowledgement of the dangers of aggressive Communism; (h) while telling a story about parents shipping the body of their child home; (i) during the conclusion when citing the dangers and the hopes we are left with which covered two minutes. Apparently the high level of feedback came during material that might produce anxiety, disagreement, or hostility. And the higher level in Sermons 2 and 4 do seem to establish that these sermons are in fact much more confronting.

The observer in the congregation who made the cough-count reported that the level of attention was generally high during all of the sermons. The minister also noticed this. Perhaps one reason was that many of the congregation knew that this research project was being carried on, and although they did not know the thesis or design, nevertheless they were more alert and expectant. The undercurrent of nervousness, as reflected in the higher cough-count, was more apparent to both the observer and the minister in Sermons 2 and 4. So the supposition that these two sermons were indeed more confronting appears to be supported by this part of the research.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

A. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has focused on the problem of the authority of the minister, particularly the conflict between the sustaining and confronting aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. William Glasser's Reality Therapy was presented as a model for the reconciliation of this conflict. His emphasis on caring involvement before confrontation was applied to the relationship between the minister and his congregation.

The thesis of this dissertation was that the closer the relationship between the minister and his congregation in terms of openness, trust, and concern for each other, the greater the chance that confrontation through the sermon will not cause rejection of the minister's leadership. In fact, there will be increased acceptance of his leadership.

The research with the three groups using the two testing instruments partially supports predictions made in connection with the statement of the thesis in Chapter I.

(1) First, it was predicted that the research results would indicate that closeness of relationship is associated with more favorable descriptions of the

minister's behavior as leader. The results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire do not support this prediction, although the results of the Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire do. Since the former instrument is standardized and more reliable, it must be given more weight. Therefore this prediction must be considered unsupported.

(2) Second, it was predicted that the results would show that rating increases as a function of confrontation. That is, that ratings by people who are close to the leader will improve more as a function of confrontation than ratings by people who are less close to him. The results of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire support this prediction, as do the results of the Feeling and Idea Communication Questionnaire. Therefore, the second prediction can be considered supported by the research.

While being in no sense conclusive, these results do indicate a direction for the solution of the central problem of this dissertation--namely the problem of the authority of the minister as seen in the conflict between the sustaining and confronting aspects of his preaching and pastoral roles. The research suggests that involvement before confrontation is essential. If the involvement with his congregation is close enough, the minister

may be able to proclaim the gospel with all of its inherent confrontation without losing their respect for his authority.

From these general conclusions arise a number of implications for preaching, counseling, and small groups in the church. These will be considered in turn.

B. IMPLICATIONS FOR PREACHING

The conclusion that the minister who is in close relationship with his people can proclaim the gospel with integrity to himself and the gospel's inherent confrontation is a strong encouragement to the minister in his preaching task. However, for the preaching minister in a large congregation this has a negative implication. He could hardly sustain close involvement with more than a minority of his congregation, and therefore his authority would be limited. Perhaps this is a good reason for keeping churches small. Since that is not likely to happen, probably the safer implication is that to be effective in preaching, the minister must maximize opportunity for closer involvement.

This general implication for preaching can be applied to four serious problems preaching faces today, as listed in Chapter II. First the church has made a mistake in relying at times chiefly on preaching to

communicate the gospel, because preaching as an isolated and monological event is inadequate as a sole means of communicating the gospel, lacking as it is in dialogical relationship. Second, preaching's apparent weakness in translating words into social change indicates an inability to relate the gospel to persons. Third, lack of opportunity for listeners to respond openly, directly, and immediately to what the preacher is saying in the sermon arouses hostility and emphasizes the need for ways to increase relationship. And fourth, the stereotypes in which the minister is held betrays the lack of close relationship between minister and people. In short, part of the authority problem of the minister arises from certain limitations in preaching as generally practiced, and these are exacerbated by lack of close relationship.

(1) In response to the indictment that the church has made a mistake in relying at times chiefly on preaching as monologue to proclaim the gospel, perhaps what is called for is a recognition that the gospel can be proclaimed in multiple ways--through counseling, administration, worship, service projects, group work. These not only proclaim the gospel, but they give the minister multiple opportunities for involvement that can enrich preaching by making it more relevant and dialogical.

(2) Preaching's apparent weakness in translating words into social change is due perhaps to the fact that our social passion has been cut off from its roots in deep personal concerns. Few preachers in this century have had the consistent social passion of Harry Emerson Fosdick. Yet Fosdick always saw social issues as directly connected to personal needs. In his study of Fosdick, Edmund Holt Linn quotes Fosdick himself on this point:

The world's economic and international situation is not alien to our personal problems. It invades them, shapes them in multitudinous ways; it undoes in us and around us much that the Christian should wish done and it does much that the Christian most should fight against. Let a preacher, therefore, start at the end of the problem where he belongs. Let him begin with the people in front of him, with what goes on inside of them because social conditions are as they are, with the economic and international reasons for many of their unchristian moods, tempers, ideas, and ideals, with their responsibilities and obligations in the matter, and in general with the tremendous stake which personal Christianity has in those powerful social forces which create the climate in which it must either live or die. Such preaching on social questions immediately concerned, establishes contact with their lives, and has at least some faint chance of doing a real business on Sunday.¹

It was through close involvement with many persons in his huge congregations, particularly through extensive pastoral counseling, that Fosdick developed such an unerring sense of personal concerns. If anything, this suggests that the source of more effective social concern in the

¹Edmund Holt Linn, Preaching as Counseling (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1966), pp. 34-35.

pulpit comes from closer involvement of the minister with his people when he is out of the pulpit.

(3) Certainly the lack of opportunity for listeners to respond openly, directly, and immediately to what the preacher is saying in the sermon can arouse hostility and anxiety and indicates the need to develop ways for feedback. This could be accomplished in part by the minister's being so sensitive to what people are thinking and feeling that he gives overt expression to this in the sermon. Another way would be to give congregations some responsibility in the preparation of the sermon, as suggested by Browne Barr in Parish Back Talk² and Dietrich Ritschl in A Theology of Proclamation.³ As was pointed out earlier by Reid in his study of small groups in relation to preaching, almost any group opportunity to respond to the sermon, particularly if the minister is present, can improve communication.⁴ Once again, the key to effective preaching seems to be closer involvement.

²Browne Barr, Parish Back Talk (New York: Abingdon Press, 1963), pp. 75-82.

³Dietrich Ritschl, A Theology of Proclamation (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 127-179.

⁴Clyde Henderson Reid, "Two-Way Communication Through Small Groups In Relation to Preaching" (Unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1960), pp. 139-140.

(4) The stereotypes in which the minister is held betrays the lack of close relationship with his people. While it is true that some people want to keep the minister on a pedestal of their own making, many prefer a more warmly human relationship with him. The minister himself can help break the stereotypes by making his preaching confessional as well as biblical. In delivering the sermon, he can deliver not only the gospel but himself as the gospel comes through him. And the self he delivers will be one who struggles and wonders and fears and hopes and believes just like everyone else. When this kind of confessional preaching is accompanied by close involvement with as many of the congregation as possible, the result promises to be more effective preaching in which the sustaining and confronting aspects of the gospel are harmoniously united.

C. IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELING

The conclusion that the minister who is in close relationship with his people can proclaim the gospel with loyalty to its inherent confrontation and without losing respect for his authority has implications for counseling. The gospel can be proclaimed in counseling as well as preaching, and its proclamation can be just as confronting as sustaining.

Pastoral counseling as influenced by Carl Rogers would claim the authority of the minister as counselor lies not only in his skill and experience as a counselor, important as this may be. It rests on his ability to reflect the acceptance of God. But the thesis of this dissertation suggests that it involves more than this. If Glasser is correct, acceptance is only one side. Confrontation is the other. Acceptance comes from becoming involved with another person, but if the relationship is arrested at this stage it is incomplete. True relationship includes not only loving acceptance but loving confrontation as well.

If this is true, we are at the beginning of a new understanding of pastoral counseling. In fact a new model of the pastoral counselor is evolving out of a model long dominated by the Rogerian "non-directive" school. Howard J. Clinebell, Jr. outlined the characteristics of this new model in an address at the Ministers' Convocation in Claremont in 1968:

- (1) It is not oriented just toward insight but toward improved relationships.
- (2) It is not interested mainly in intrapsychic problems, but in a relationship of we-ness.
- (3) It is not limited to any one system of therapy but uses a variety of therapies as tools.
- (4) It may be informal as to setting and structure as well as formal.

- (5) It emphasizes the present rather than delving in the past.
- (6) It stresses behavior in addition to feelings.
- (7) It moves beyond mere acceptance to confrontation.
- (8) It tends to make religion explicit at times rather than keeping it always implicit.
- (9) It goes in for short-term supportive counseling rather than long-term uncovering.
- (10) It avoids professionalism in favor of non-professionalism.⁵

Clinebell's model is not unlike Glasser's. Both suggest that counseling must move beyond the place where it has been standing--namely, in non-directive acceptance --to a more confronting stance. Certainly counseling by ministers must be more confronting if it is to be true to the kerygma and match the confrontation in preaching. If this can be achieved, perhaps some of the conflict between the sustaining and confronting aspects of the pastoral role can be resolved.

D. IMPLICATIONS FOR SMALL GROUPS

The conclusion concerning the need for close involvement by the minister with his congregation carries with it an implication about the importance of small

⁵Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., address at Southern California Council of Churches Ministers Convocation. Claremont United Church of Christ, January 22, 1968.

groups as a way for the minister to build involvement and effect confrontation. However, from the research we have seen that there are different levels and qualities of involvement. For example, the hypothesis about Group I was that they would rate the minister highest. The fact that they rated him lowest on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire may not necessarily mean that they have less respect for his authority. Rather it may have more to do with the fact that they were a peer group to the minister and that because of this their evaluations were more candid. If such was the case, then their close involvement with him facilitated a kind of two-way confrontation in which both the minister and the group members were honest with one another. That this can be done without any loss in their respect for him is seen in the fact that Group I's ratings rose in the second testing that came after confrontation. This may be one of the most important implications coming out of the research. Certainly it points up the importance of the level and quality of involvement which are variables difficult to control or measure, but certainly worth more study.

The experience of the minister in his work with the two Dialogue Groups that made up Groups I and II implies that there is a sizeable minority in every church who can become involved with the minister to a significant degree.

And the strong response and consistent interest in the project by the volunteers who made up Group III implies that there are probably more persons in most congregations than is realized who are desirous and capable of more involvement than is offered them. This leads to some other implications concerning small groups in the church suggested by Reid in the conclusion of his study of two-way communication through small groups in relation to preaching:

(1) Ministers and Christian educators need to take seriously the insights and contributions of modern communication research as they apply to the work of the church . . .

(2) Ministers should begin to take small groups more seriously, regarding them as an absolute necessity for the renewal of the church . . .

(3) Ministers should attempt to use the existing framework of their church organizations to encourage a deeper level of communication on spiritual matters . . .

(4) Ministers should encourage their parishioners to study the principles of group process so that they may improve the quality of their own meetings without depending on the minister for such guidance.

(5) Lay persons who feel the need of small group fellowship should urge their ministers to help them establish such groups in their churches . . .

(6) Ministers should encourage spiritual retreats for small units of their congregations to help initiate people into the spiritual life, and to help them gain perspective on their everyday activities . . .

(7) Ministers and lay leaders should seek to extend the small group principle into the area of youth work . . .

(8) When feasible the minister should provide opportunities for a two-way flow of conversation about the sermon, preferably in established groups . . .

(9) On the level of seminary education, more adequate preparation in group work should be given men entering the ministry . . .

(10) Denominational groups should be urged to encourage the small group movement among the laity . . .

(11) Finally, it may be in order to suggest that efforts be made to establish some experimental churches which would be oriented around small groups . . . ⁶

This list is almost entirely consonant with the thesis of this dissertation that involvement is central to minister-parishioner relations.

E. DANGERS

Two key words in this dissertation are involvement and confrontation. We have explored their implications in many directions, but we need to mention five dangers they imply:

(1) Both involvement and confrontation involve risk. It is not easy to risk oneself with someone who may be rejecting. Even the act of accepting another person in the interest of becoming involved with him can be so threatening that he will rebuff overtures. And confronting someone one does care about may threaten the

⁶Reid, op. cit., pp. 147-151.

relationship even more. Both involvement and confrontation require considerable ego strength.

(2) In establishing involvement, there is a danger in being over-accepting. Many relationships never get beyond acceptance. This is one of the dangers of non-directive counseling. It is also one of the pitfalls of the insecure minister who is uncertain of his authority. Real relationship must move beyond mere acceptance to the greater gift and the greater risk of confrontation.

(3) Confrontation is always in danger of becoming neo-moralism. It can become a foolish attempt to play God with others, and is therefore a great temptation for those who enjoy dominating others. The only protection against this is genuine involvement, which means practicing the Rogerian precepts of really listening to and empathizing with the other person until congruence occurs.

(4) Confrontation can build unhealthy dependency relationships for the person whose ego is weak. If one of the chief purposes of counseling is to "adultify" persons and help them stand on their own feet as mature adults, then the person using confrontation must guard against his own need to have others dependent on him.

It must be cautioned that confrontation with involvement does not always work. The risk of failure is always present in human relationships because of the complicated nature of human interaction. This

dissertation has been concerned with what can be done to minimize these risks and maximize the positive possibilities.

F. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This dissertation has only scratched the surface of the vast area surrounding the relationship of the minister to his congregation and his own understanding of his several roles. It suggests three areas for more concentrated research:

(1) One such area would certainly be a study in depth of non-verbal communication by the minister, both in preaching and in leading groups. New techniques using video-tape could be of enormous help to ministers in analyzing their behavior. The aid of practitioners of other disciplines--psychology, psychiatry, etc.--might be enlisted.

(2) More research on congregational responses to ministerial leadership would help fill in the other side of the minister-congregation relationship. For example, data such as that collected in this research could, if processed by computer under the direction of a skilled statistician, yield much more information.

(3) With the roles of the minister changing as they are in our day, the time is ripe for more careful research into what new forms of ministry are called for.

There is a need to check such valuable concepts as H. Richard Niebuhr's idea of the minister as "pastoral director" with the tools of psychological and sociological research.

G. CONCLUSION

The authority of the minister is under question in our day. It is questioned by the world, the church, and the minister himself. This dissertation has explored one aspect of this authority--namely, the conflict between the sustaining and confronting aspects of the minister's preaching and pastoral roles. As a result of this study, the following may be affirmed. The key to the reconciliation of the sustaining and confronting aspects of the minister's roles quite possibly lies in the quality of the relationship between the minister and his congregation, before, during, and after confrontation. Small groups seem to offer the best opportunity for this kind of relationship. Where that relationship is one of close involvement, including trust and genuine concern for each other, then confrontation can take place in such a way that the minister loses none of their respect for his leadership. And when that confrontation comes in preaching, the minister will be able to present the gospel with all its indigenous confrontation without decreasing

respect for his leadership. This kind of involvement, however, involves real risks for the minister and the congregant. But if the authority of the minister is under as serious question today as it seems to be, the risks may be worth taking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashbrook, James B. "Ministerial Leadership in Church Organizations," Ministry Studies, I (May 1967).
- Barr, Browne. Parish Back Talk. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Blees, Robert A. and Staff of First Community Church, Columbus, Ohio. Counseling with Teen-agers. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Bosley, Harold. Preaching on Controversial Issues. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.
- Bowers, Margaretta K. Conflicts of the Clergy. New York: Nelson, 1963.
- Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- _____. Address at Southern California Council of Churches Ministers Convocation. Claremont United Church of Christ-Congregational, January 22, 1968.
- _____. Mental Health Through Christian Community. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Conway, Bertrand L. The Question Box. New York: Paulist Press, 1929.
- Drakeford, John W. Integrity Therapy. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1967.
- Edwards, K. Morgan. "Grace: The Dominant Note in Preaching." Convocation Address, Claremont, September 29, 1965.
- Fielder, Fred E. "A Comparative Investigation of Early Therapeutic Relationships Created by Non-experts of the Psychoanalytic, Non-directive and Adlerian Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959.
- Gardner, Harry H., and Jeans, Robert F. "Confrontation Technique in Psychotherapy: Some Existential Implications," Journal of Existential Psychiatry, II:8 (Spring 1962), 393-405.
- Glasser, William. Mental Health or Mental Illness. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

- _____. Address at Southern California Council of Churches Ministers Convocation. Claremont Congregational Church, January 24, 1967.
- _____. Reality Therapy, A New Approach to Psychiatry. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- _____, and Iverson, Norman. Reality Therapy in Large Group Counseling. Los Angeles: Reality Press, 1966.
- Hall, James T. "Measuring the Communication of Feeling During Worship," Pastoral Psychology, XIV:137 (October 1963), 50-58.
- Harvey, Van A. A Handbook of Theological Terms. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Haselden, Kyle. The Urgency of Preaching. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Heine, R. W. "A Comparison of Patient's Reports on Psychotherapeutic Experience with Psychoanalytic, Non-Directive and Adlerian Therapists." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.
- Hemphill, John K., and Coons, Alvin E. "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," in Stogdill and Coons, op. cit., pp. 6-38.
- Hiltner, Seward, and Colston, Lowell G. The Context of Pastoral Counseling. New York: Abingdon Press, 1961.
- Jackson, Edgar N. A Psychology for Preaching. Great Neck: Channel Press, 1961.
- Knight, James A. "Confrontation in Counseling with Special Emphasis on the Student Setting," Pastoral Psychology, XVI:159 (December 1965), 48-55.
- Langguth, Jack. "William Glasser: California's Gift to Psychotherapy," Harper's Magazine, CCXXXIV:1405 (June 1967), 52-56.
- Linn, Edmond Holt. Preaching as Counseling. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1966.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. The New Group Therapy. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

- Oden, Thomas C. Kerygma and Counseling. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Old Testament Theology. Vol. 2. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Random House Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged ed. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Reid, Clyde Henderson. "Two-Way Communication Through Small Groups in Relation to Preaching." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1960.
- Ritschl, Dietrich. A Theology of Proclamation. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960.
- Silberman, Charles E. "Is Technology Taking Over?," Fortune, LXXIII:2 (February 1966), 220.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII. An Experimental Revision. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1963.
- _____, and Coons, Alvin E., eds. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement (Research Monograph 88), Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957.
- Teikmanis, Arthur L. Preaching and Pastoral Care. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Trueblood, Elton. The Yoke of Christ and Other Sermons. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1966.
- Winter, Gibson. The New Creation as Metropolis. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Rev. Harry W. Adams
3010 Trudi Lane
Burbank, California

Dear _____

I am looking for some people with both honesty and openness. That's why I am writing to you.

I would like to ask your help in an interesting project I have undertaken in connection with my doctoral dissertation. It is a study of congregational response to sermons.

The part I am asking you to play is as a "reactor." This means, first of all, being in church to hear the sermons on four consecutive Sundays--November 12, 19, 26 and December 3--if at all possible.

Second, you will be asked to take a "Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire" designed to evaluate the minister's behavior in general. It has 100 multiple-choice questions and will be taken twice by each reactor, once before the series begins and once afterward.

Third, you will be requested to react by taking a very simple questionnaire immediately after hearing each of the four sermons that tell what you felt and thought as you listened.

That means only about 3 or 4 hours time giving your reactions in a unique research that may help ministers relate better to their congregations when they preach.

I realize this calls for real honesty on your part and genuine openness on mine. If you will participate--and I hope you will--just return the enclosed postcard. I promise to share the results with you.

Hopefully yours,

Harry W. Adams

APPENDIX B

Member Opinionaire on Social Problems

The Social Creed of the Methodist Church states, "In our historic position we have sought to follow Christ in bringing the whole of life, with its activities, possessions and relationships, into conformity with the will of God.

As Methodists we have an obligation to affirm our position on social and economic questions."

In an effort to know our collective positions your Commission on Social Concerns wishes to identify the chief areas of concern of the congregation. Please rate the five areas among the following list according to the degree of your concern. Use the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, to indicate your relative concern with 1 indicating the highest.

(That is, if you believe that The Lack of Respect for Authority is today's greatest problem you would rate it (1). If you believe that The War in Viet Nam is the next greatest problem you would rate it (2). Then use 3, 4, and 5 to rate the next three problems according to their relative importance.) Place 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 alongside those items which represent your five greatest concerns.

____Illegal Use of Narcotics

____Lack of Respect for Authority

____War in Viet Nam

- ☐ Extremists in Our Society
- ☐ Capital Punishment
- ☐ "Hippie Movement"
- ☐ Race Relations
- ☐ Automation
- ☐ Population Explosion
- ☐ Pressures of Urban Life
- ☐ Poverty in Our Land
- ☐ Communism
- ☐ Other (Specify)

APPENDIX C

July 31, 1967

Report to the Congregation

The Commission on Social Concerns of the Burbank First Methodist Church circulated an opinionnaire on social problems to those at worship during services on July 16, and also on July 23 to those who did not receive one on the 16th.

A total of 396 people responded by filling out the opinionnaire. It was necessary to disqualify 16 of the replies. Of these replies which were tabulated, 256 were from members of our church, 94 were non-members, and 40 respondents gave no indication of their membership status.

From the results of this opinionnaire we now are able to identify five areas that appear to be of greatest concern to those who responded:

1. The War in Viet Nam
2. The Lack of Respect for Authority
3. Race Relations
4. The Illegal Use of Narcotics
5. Communism

These same items appeared in the same order as the chief concerns among members and non-members alike. We believe that the size of the response was sufficient to warrant a program for the year involving forums, discussions, further surveys, and reading lists which relate to

these five topics. It is possible that these activities might then lead to action of some type as yet not determined.

John Young
Chairman

APPENDIX D

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE--Form XII

Originated by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies
and revised by the
Bureau of Business Research

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term, "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

Published by
Bureau of Business Research
College of Commerce and Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Copyright 1962

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always
 B = Often
 C = Occasionally
 D = Seldom
 E = Never

- e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described..... A B C D E

Example: He never acts as described..... A B C D E

Example: He occasionally acts as described... A B C D E

-
1. He acts as the spokesman of the group..... A B C D E
 2. He waits patiently for the results of
a decision..... A B C D E
 3. He makes pep talks to stimulate the
group..... A B C D E
 4. He lets group members know what is
expected of them..... A B C D E
 5. He allows the members complete freedom
in their work..... A B C D E
 6. He is hesitant about taking initiative
in the group..... A B C D E
 7. He is friendly and approachable..... A B C D E
 8. He encourages overtime work..... A B C D E
 9. He makes accurate decisions..... A B C D E

10. He gets along well with the people
above him..... A B C D E
11. He publicizes the activities of the
group..... A B C D E
12. He becomes anxious when he cannot find
out what is coming next..... A B C D E
13. His arguments are convincing..... A B C D E
14. He encourages the use of uniform
procedures..... A B C D E
15. He permits the members to use their own
judgment in solving problems..... A B C D E
16. He fails to make necessary action..... A B C D E
17. He does little things to make it
pleasant to be a member of the group..... A B C D E
18. He stresses being ahead of competing
groups..... A B C D E
19. He keeps the group working together
as a team..... A B C D E
20. He keeps the group in good standing
with higher authority..... A B C D E
21. He speaks as the representative of
the group..... A B C D E
22. He accepts defeat in stride..... A B C D E
23. He argues persuasively for his
point of view..... A B C D E
24. He tries out his ideas in the group..... A B C D E
25. He encourages initiative in the
group members..... A B C D E
26. He lets other persons take away his
leadership in the group..... A B C D E
27. He puts suggestions made by the
group into operation..... A B C D E

28. He needles members for greater effort..... A B C D E
29. He seems able to predict what is coming next..... A B C D E
30. He is working hard for a promotion..... A B C D E
31. He speaks for the group when visitors are present..... A B C D E
32. He accepts delays without becoming upset..... A B C D E
33. He is a very persuasive talker..... A B C D E
34. He makes his attitudes clear to the group..... A B C D E
35. He lets the members do their work the way they think best..... A B C D E
36. He lets some members take advantage of him..... A B C D E
37. He treats all group members as his equals..... A B C D E
38. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace..... A B C D E
39. He settles conflicts when they occur in the group..... A B C D E
40. His superiors act favorably on most of his suggestions..... A B C D E
41. He represents the group at outside meetings..... A B C D E
42. He becomes anxious when waiting for new developments..... A B C D E
43. He is very skillful in an argument..... A B C D E
44. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done..... A B C D E
45. He assigns a task, then lets the members handle it..... A B C D E

46. He is the leader of the group in
name only..... A B C D E
47. He gives advance notice of changes..... A B C D E
48. He pushes for increased production..... A B C D E
49. Things usually turn out as he predicts... A B C D E
50. He enjoys the privileges of his
position..... A B C D E
51. He handles complex problems
efficiently..... A B C D E
52. He is able to tolerate postponement
and uncertainty..... A B C D E
53. He is not a very convincing talker..... A B C D E
54. He assigns group members to particular
tasks..... A B C D E
55. He turns the members loose on a job,
and lets them go to it..... A B C D E
56. He backs down when he ought to stand
firm..... A B C D E
57. He keeps to himself..... A B C D E
58. He asks the members to work harder..... A B C D E
59. He is accurate in predicting the
trend of events..... A B C D E
60. He gets his superiors to act for the
welfare of the group members..... A B C D E
61. He gets swamped by details..... A B C D E
62. He can wait just so long, then
blows up..... A B C D E
63. He speaks from a strong inner
conviction..... A B C D E
64. He makes sure that his part in the
group is understood by the group
members..... A B C D E

65. He is reluctant to allow the members
any freedom of action..... A B C D E
66. He lets some members have authority
that he should keep..... A B C D E
67. He looks out for the personal welfare
of group members..... A B C D E
68. He permits the members to take it easy
in their work..... A B C D E
69. He sees to it that the work of the
group is coordinated..... A B C D E
70. His word carries weight with his
superiors..... A B C D E
71. He gets things all tangled up..... A B C D E
72. He remains calm when uncertain about
coming events..... A B C D E
73. He is an inspiring talker..... A B C D E
74. He schedules the work to be done..... A B C D E
75. He allows the group a high degree of
initiative..... A B C D E
76. He takes full charge when emergencies
arise..... A B C D E
77. He is willing to make changes..... A B C D E
78. He drives hard when there is a job
to be done..... A B C D E
79. He helps group members settle their
differences..... A B C D E
80. He gets what he asks for from his
superiors..... A B C D E
81. He can reduce a madhouse to system
and order..... A B C D E
82. He is able to delay action until the
proper time occurs..... A B C D E

83. He persuades others that his ideas
are to their advantage..... A B C D E
84. He maintains definite standards of
performance..... A B C D E
85. He trusts the members to exercise
good judgment..... A B C D E
86. He overcomes attempts made to
challenge his leadership..... A B C D E
87. He refuses to explain his actions..... A B C D E
88. He urges the group to beat its
previous record..... A B C D E
89. He anticipates problems and plans
for them..... A B C D E
90. He is working his way to the top..... A B C D E
91. He gets confused when too many
demands are made of him..... A B C D E
92. He worries about the outcome of
any new procedure..... A B C D E
93. He can inspire enthusiasm for a
project..... A B C D E
94. He asks that group members follow
standard rules and regulations..... A B C D E
95. He permits the group to act at its
own pace..... A B C D E
96. He is easily recognized as the leader
of the group..... A B C D E
97. He acts without consulting the
group..... A B C D E
98. He keeps the group working up to
capacity..... A B C D E
99. He maintains a closely knit group..... A B C D E
100. He maintains cordial relations with
superiors..... A B C D E

APPENDIX E

LBDQ Form XII - RECORD SHEET

													<u>Totals</u>
1. Representation	1	11	21	31	41								()
2. Reconciliation						51	61	71	81	91			()
3. Tol. Uncertainty	2	12	22	32	42	52	62	72	82	92			()
4. Persuasion	3	13	23	33	43	53	63	73	83	93			()
5. Structure	4	14	24	34	44	54	64	74	84	94			()
6. Tol. Freedom	5	15	25	35	45	55	65	75	85	95			()
7. Role Assumption	6	16	26	36	46	56	66	76	86	96			()
8. Consideration	7	17	27	37	47	57	67	77	87	97			()
9. Production Emph.	8	18	28	38	48	58	68	78	88	98			()
10. Predictive Acc.	9		29		49	59			89				()
11. Integration		19		39			69	79		99			()
12. Superior Orient	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100			()

APPENDIX F

FEELING AND IDEA COMMUNICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ Date _____

1. Do you think you have a better grasp now of the subject dealt with in the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
2. Do you feel your faith is stronger because of the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
3. Do you find your ideas were changed by the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
4. Do you feel that the minister had your interest at heart during the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
5. Would you like to discuss the sermon with the minister?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
6. Did the minister show a reverent attitude during the service?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
7. Do you think the sermon was easy to understand?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
8. Do you feel that the minister was sincere during the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
9. Do you have a better appreciation of the minister's point of view now?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
10. Do you feel moved to do something because of the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
11. Did the minister show a spirit of gladness during the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___

12. Do you find this sermon "Christian" as you understand it?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
13. Did the minister seem irritated at the congregation during the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
14. Can you remember any idea presented in the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
15. Did you feel that the minister acted superior to (was "looking down on") the congregation?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
16. Are you shaken in your faith by the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
17. Did the minister show a lack of confidence during the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
18. Do you think it was worth your time to hear the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
19. Was the minister tense during the sermon?
Yes___ Some___ A little___ No___
20. Do you have any suggestions to improve the sermon?

Remarks:

APPENDIX G

SERMON 1 (NOVEMBER 12)

	Group I	Group II	Group III
1. Information			
Yes, some, a little	85.6%	100%	100%
No	14.4		
2. Strength			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	86.4
No			13.6
3. Growth			
Yes, some, a little	28.6	62.5	45.5
No	71.4	37.5	54.5
4. Understanding			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
5. Openness			
Yes, some, a little	71.5	100	68.2
No	28.5		31.8
6. Reverence			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
7. Clarity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
8. Sincerity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
9. Tolerance			
Yes, some, a little	85.8	100	95.5
No	14.2		4.5
10. Inspiration			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	86.4
No			13.6

APPENDIX G (Continued)

11. Joy			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
12. Theology			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
13. Hostility			
Yes, some, a little	14.3	12.5	4.6
No	85.7	87.5	95.4
14. Impact			
Yes, some, a little	85.8	100	100
No	14.2		
15. Conceit			
Yes, some, a little	14.3		
No	85.7	100	100
16. Destructiveness			
Yes, some, a little		25	4.6
No	100	75	95.4
17. Inferiority			
Yes, some, a little	14.3		9.1
No	85.7	100	90.9
18. Worthiness			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	86.3
No			13.7
19. Anxiety			
Yes, some, a little	14.3	37.5	27.3
No	<u>85.7</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>72.7</u>
Mean % of positive responses	89.4	94	90.6

APPENDIX G (Continued)

20. Suggestions

More stress on relationship to Christ to avoid "aloneness." "No Man is an Island" is a favorite of mine--thanks for including reference to it.

I don't recall hearing you mention about the loneliness one feels during an unexpected death of a loved one. It seems to me this is the time people somewhat fear and yet I have seen people with strong faiths and believe they are "not alone" get through this moment with joy and gladness.

I have to make a decision this week and it isn't easy, especially since it has to be made by myself with no help.

Point was made quite well.

It was well done.

You covered the subject very well. You seem to understand "people" pretty well.

Maybe this reaction series is making for better preparation of sermons. Maybe a little better spacing on this form. Found myself getting the wrong space for the answer.

Emphasis seemed to be on overall expression of attitudes. How does one change the attitude or feelings responsible?

Points were definite, easy to grasp. Examples were well chosen.

The ideas he presented are basic and simple--but ideas we need to be reminded of because in their simplicity, these ideas are often just taken for granted --and forgotten.

I liked the clarification of an idea that I have been kicking around for some time--although I have never been able to achieve a clear verbal expression of the thought that Harry did. That is: there are some relationships that require complete openness and giving of self, others in which we must learn to withhold some of ourselves or "insulate."

APPENDIX G (Continued)

The trick is to alternate. Even now I express myself badly--but liked the idea.

I liked Mr. Adams' use of quotes and his ability to relate them to our individual problems, in this way helping us identify with the sermon.

I always come away with the same feeling that I wished there was some way I could help. I would like to hear of more examples of such ways. (eg.--girl offering hand)

No improvements needed. The words were well thought out and presented in a concise, easily understood manner. Structurally, the sermon was arranged very well, making it easy for the listener to follow the various transitions in thought.

Everyone experiences loneliness at some point in his life. I have often wondered how I would face it if something were to happen to one of my close loved ones. I know it would be a lonely feeling, but how would I react to it?

Just keep preaching the same good sermons.

Good sermon, delivered well, good subject matter. To me, sermons should deal with "gut" issues of Christianity.

APPENDIX H
SERMON 3 (NOVEMBER 26)

	Group I	Group II	Group III
1. Information			
Yes, some, a little	100%	100%	95.5%
No			4.5
2. Strength			
Yes, some, a little	87.5	75	86.4
No	12.5	25	13.6
3. Growth			
Yes, some, a little	75	50	59.1
No	25	50	40.9
4. Understanding			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.5
No			4.5
5. Openness			
Yes, some, a little	62.5	87.5	59.1
No	37.5	12.5	40.9
6. Reverence			
Yes, some, a little	100	87.5	100
No		12.5	
7. Clarity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	95.5
No			4.5
8. Sincerity			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
9. Tolerance			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	91
No			9
10. Inspiration			
Yes, some, a little	75	62.5	64
No	25	37.5	36

APPENDIX H (Continued)

11. Joy			
Yes, some, a little	87.5	87.5	95.5
No	12.5	12.5	4.5
12. Theology			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
13. Hostility			
Yes, some, a little	25	12.5	4.6
No	75	87.5	95.4
14. Impact			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
15. Conceit			
Yes, some, a little			4.6
No	100	100	95.4
16. Destructiveness			
Yes, some, a little		25	14
No	100	75	86
17. Inferiority			
Yes, some, a little		25	9.1
No	100	75	90.9
18. Worthiness			
Yes, some, a little	100	100	100
No			
19. Anxiety			
Yes, some, a little		25	23
No	<u>100</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>77</u>
Mean % of positive responses	92.7	87.5	88.8

APPENDIX H (Continued)

20. Suggestions

Seemed like Harry wasn't in this one.

Harry looked very tired at the start, but soon lost "that look."

I feel that this sermon gives me a better understanding of confusion of evil and death and our role in helping others and ourselves handle them without having our faith shaken.

Very good!

I'm still confused on this subject.

It was a difficult sermon for Harry I feel. The words were difficult to follow--I again tried to outline and almost couldn't.

Your sermons always seem to meet the vital needs in every Christian's life. To be a good evaluator I should criticize once in awhile--later.

I once remarked to Harry that I could not face death with suffering--knowing there was no cure--was it wrong to take one's own life rather than suffer? He gave me an answer today. I looked at disease as conquering a person. Now I can see the other side and perhaps in my work with the ill in the hospital I will be able to help them.

Missed your glasses.

What happened to your glasses?

I liked the use of at least several scripture references.

The introduction was a little negative, but it improved as you went along.

Had a little trouble staying with you--had just listened to Dr. Carlson preach on faith healing, and things you said kept reminding me of statements he had made. I found myself comparing the 2 sermons. Sorry I wandered.

APPENDIX H (Continued)

Very interesting: it seems each sermon is "better" than the last. Are they? Or is it because I'm concentrating?

The minister expressed my exact feelings on the subject of evil.

Excellent sermon.

Inspirational type sermon. But there was still some communication on a non-verbal level by the minister of which he was apparently unaware.

APPENDIX I

Sermon 1: CONQUERING LONELINESS

Minutes	Coughs	Text:
		John 16:32 "The hour is coming, indeed it has come, when you will be scattered, every man to his home, and will leave me alone; but I am not alone, for the Father is with me."
1	0	What is loneliness? Leslie Weatherhead says it's different from solitude. "Loneliness is the state of being spiritually alone. Solitude is the state of being geographically alone."¹ Loneliness is a terrifying thing; solitude is a good thing. Solitude is what Greta Garbo was talking about back in the thirties when she said, "I want to be alone." Later on somebody called her on it and said, "Do you really want to be lonely?" and she said, "Oh, no, no. You misunderstand. What I mean is I want to be left alone. I do not want reporters and other people poking into my private life."² She was talking about solitude, and solitude is a good thing. Loneliness is something else. Tolstoy, I think, in one of his novels, tells about a hotel doorman whose son dies during the night. The doorman is so insecure in his position he fears that he must work even though his son has just died, lest he lose his job. All day long as he opens the door for people and greets them at their cabs, he keeps saying, "My son just died, my son just died." And nobody all day long hears him. He has people around him all the time, and he is so terribly alone. That is loneliness. Jesus understood the difference between solitude and loneliness. He sought out solitude. There are verses that say something like this: "He was alone praying." (Luke 9:18). And on one occasion when the crowd was pressing in upon him it says, "He withdrew from there in a boat to a lonely place." (Matthew 13:14). Apparently Jesus loved solitude, but he hated loneliness. He sought out the companionship of his friends. In another place it says that he called his disciples that they might be with
3	4	

him. (Mark 3:13). He needed their companionship. He took Peter and James and John with him on the Mount of Transfiguration. In the Garden of Gethsemane he called Peter and James and John

to go with him. Then when they fell asleep he said with disappointment, "Couldn't you watch with me for one hour?" (Mark 14:37). Jesus loved solitude, but he needed companionship.

In a deeper sense I think that Jesus recognized that there are some experiences that everybody has to go through alone. Nobody can do it for you. It is you, there, your being alone. In a sense of course we are not alone. Even when we are most alone, we are not alone. That's what this text is all about. "The hour is coming," Jesus said to his disciples, "indeed it has come when you will be scattered everyone to his own home, and will leave me alone; but I am not alone, for the Father is with me." In this

sense I think we know that we are not completely alone. But there is a real danger here that we will jump to an easy belief in God in order to avoid our own desperate aloneness when we are making decisions, when we are facing experiences that nobody can face for us. It is what W. H. Auden calls the "cosmic papa."³ We want someone to hold our hand, to take the brunt of the experience for us. And this can never be done. We try to cover up the fact that in the depths of ourselves there are some moments when we have to walk alone. How then do we discover a way to face our essential loneliness, and at the same time discover how we belong to ourselves, to other people and to God?

What I have to say to you is broken down into two major categories. First, loneliness, and second, belonging. Now let's look at loneliness.

I. LONELINESS

Remember a moment ago I said that loneliness is the state of being spiritually alone. Another way of saying this would be to say that the lonely lack relationships with other people.⁴ There is so much loneliness in our world. One night I went to the movies and I was astounded

at the number of single men in the theater. Single persons seated one by one. Not together, but scattered over this four or five hundred seats.

Occasionally I get up early in the morning. I don't want to disturb my wife. I come down to a restaurant to have breakfast and I find the lonely, single men of our world eating alone. Have you ever been in a hotel lobby and looked around at the lonely people searching the eyes and faces of people who walk by? Have you ever sat alone in a hotel room like a monk's cell? Recently I was in such a hotel room, opened the drawer; there was no Gideon Bible but there was a beer can opener! Anything to "kill time," to assuage the loneliness. Oh, there is so much loneliness in our world.

Perhaps some of the loneliness I mentioned just now could be avoided, but there are other times when we must walk alone. Let's look at some examples of loneliness that can't be avoided.

Think of the loneliness of the only child. It's not uncommon for an only child to invent companions, to have a rich fantasy life of persons that he plays with mentally. Then when another child is born into the family, what happens? The attention that he used to receive goes to the new child and he feels even more alone than he did before. I remember as an only child my own childhood and the games that I played and the playmates that I imagined. This is the kind of loneliness that has to be lived through.

Or think of the young person who goes to the university. In high school he has been a good student, an "A" student. He has been a member of the scholarship society. He has received a scholarship to go to the university. And then suddenly he finds himself with the cream of the crop. No longer the brightest boy in the class, he is just one among a number of bright young people. His grades are not all "A's" anymore and he begins to feel that he is a disappointment to himself and to his family and his friends. I think of a young woman who went

away to university in just these circumstances, and when she found that her grades were not the top grades of the class she became despondent and attempted to take her own life. The number of students in university that attempt suicide is alarming school officials. It is when we begin to feel cut-off and alone, when we have to walk through that valley that nobody can go with but us--that's what it means to be alone.

10 10 Turn to the business world and a young man just starting out. His first weeks in a bank, or an office, or a factory where he knows no one, where he can't show them his press clippings. That's what it means to be alone. A friend of ours, taking a new job, moved from a very small company where he knew everyone into one of the largest corporations in the southland where there were 5,000 employees. He knows no one. He has spent the last three months confused, disoriented, alone, and he realizes that as long as he works in this company he will never know more than just a few people. He will always be alone. That kind of loneliness can't be avoided either.

11 5 Then there is the loneliness of the elderly. On the back of the church property at a church I once served, there was a small house that we rented out to an elderly tenant. When she did not come out for her usual walk to the market, the neighbors became concerned, called the police and when the police broke in we discovered that she had apparently had a stroke. Then we learned some other things about her life. She had sealed herself off from the world. She had had all of the locks on the doors changed. She had the windows double-bolted. She had dark, dark curtains and blinds that could be drawn in the middle of the day. She had sealed herself off from the world and then it acted as a kind of double thing. She was afraid of anybody getting in and then when we wanted to help her and when she needed us most, we were locked out. The loneliness of being older!

Let's never forget the loneliness of those who stand against the tide of popular thinking. Sigmund Freud worked for twenty years

12 3 with little or no public recognition. He went on for forty years working, working as the world gradually began to recognize the contribution he was making. Why was he able to do it? Because in those first ten years he was able to face his desperate aloneness. Working without co-worker or colleague, all by himself, hammering it out.⁵

13 4 I suppose that what I am trying to say is that we have to face our basic aloneness. Childbirth is an experience like this. You know, the family gathers, the friends have a shower, there are gifts brought, we feel good about the baby that is to come, and then there comes that moment of the birth of the child and the mother and father stand together, and yet alone. Nobody can be there with them. Marriage is like that. A minister in California, who was participating in the marriage of his daughter, and was about to give the benediction, looked at his daughter and said this: "From this day forward my dear your mother and I have no more plans for you. Many dreams, but no plans."⁶ Never laugh when a mother or father cry at a wedding. It's a lonely moment. There are moments of decision when you know you have to decide, nobody else can do it for you. You can get all the advice from your friends, but then there comes that moment when it is you, you alone. Bereavement is like that too. There the loneliness is inevitable. Your friends and neighbors will be kind and considerate, and minister to your needs. But no one can lift that burden for us. You have to walk through that valley alone.

14 7 One afternoon a long time ago a young man cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" No matter how lonely you and I ever get, we will never be as alone as Jesus that day. He had to walk that valley alone. That's loneliness.

II. COMPANIONSHIP

Now having looked at loneliness, perhaps in more detail than is comfortable, let's

understand what companionship and belongingness mean. If loneliness is a lack of relationship, then companionship is a sufficiency of relationships. But how much relationship is enough?

15 3 Arthur Miller, writing in Harper's magazine tells about going with a social worker who is working with some juvenile delinquents in New York City to a local sandlot where the boys played baseball.⁷ He observed a very interesting thing. When the gang was playing in the field, if the ball was hit to left field, the whole team rushed out to left field and gathered around the boy who was trying to catch the ball because they couldn't face the humiliation of his dropping the ball. They were so closely tied to each other that they couldn't stand the possibility that one of them might fail. And this, you see, is the kind of closeness that smothers us.

16 7 On the other hand, William Whyte, Jr. in his book The Organization Man says that the organization executive who gets moved around the country from one place to another learns that you need human relationships but that you must never let them get too deep.⁸ He says it is like being a shipboard traveler. You never let the thing get too close because you know someday the boat is going to dock and you are going to go your separate ways. Which is the best way, to be so close, so tied to your friends that anything that they do shatters you, or to be so aloof, so insulated that you can cut off relationships without feeling? Neither way, of course, is right. There has to be a way of alternation between the two. May I suggest that we can find adequate companionship even though we recognize that there are certain moments that we have to be alone. I want to suggest four principles.

17 11 The first, is to move away from self deceptions to self honesty. That means admitting that you are lonely. Most of us go through life trying to dodge the fact that we are lonely. How do we do it? I was reading a list the other day. Here is a pretty good list. We try work, leisure, drink, sex, psychiatry, marriage, and if these all fail, self-pity, and finally prayer. When we feel that we are alone, this is

the direction in which we go. But we really get nowhere until we acknowledge that we are lonely. Leslie Weatherhead tells about Rupert Brooke, the British poet, who on one occasion was taking a boat from Liverpool.⁹ He went down to the dock. He was all alone. The people around him had friends there to see them off, there were parties, confetti. He was feeling so lonely. He saw a little boy standing on the dock obviously not with anybody there because the boy was very dirty. He walked up and said, "I don't have anybody to see me off. What's your name." The boy said, "I'm William, Sir." "Well, William, if I give you a sixpence would you wave goodbye to me?" Anxious to make the money, William said, "Why, of course." Brooke got back on the boat and as the boat eased away from the pier, little William went up to the railing on the dock, took out his very dirty handkerchief and began to wave goodbye, and shouted true messages of farewell that Rupert Brooke could not hear. The last thing he saw as the boat pulled away was dear William waving goodbye. Loneliness is a terrible thing. But you really can't do anything about it until you recognize you are lonely, until you make that move outward, until you say, "This is the way I am, and maybe there is some little thing I can do that will assuage the way I feel."

A second way to move into meaningful companionship and relationship is to move away from your fears to folks--to move away from fears to folks. I know an older couple that are having a very difficult time adjusting to their new environment. They have left their home, they have pulled up their roots, they are now trying to find themselves, and yet they are afraid to risk themselves, to move out, to make new friends, for fear they will get rejected. They will not move from fears to folks. All I know is that when the world gets too much for me, when I am alone too much, the best thing I can do is put aside the books and the ideas and the papers and the administration and the problems, and be with people for a while. I think most of us have this relationship in our families. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the German theologian arrested by the Nazis, spent a year or more in jail. And in writing to his family this is what

20 4 he said to them: "One thing that I do miss is sitting down to table with others. This eating alone is bad. The presents you sent me acquire sacramental value. They remind me of the times we have sat down to table together."¹⁰ It is this close relationship around the table that means so much. Charles Shultz, the creator of "Peanuts" said one evening they were all at dinner together and his daughter Amy was talking a blue streak. Nobody could get a word in edgewise. Finally Shultz said, "Can't you please be quiet, Amy?" She was silent for a moment and then picked up a piece of bread and began to butter it saying, "Dad am I buttering too loud for you?" There are times when we need to be quiet and to be alone, but the greatest moments are when we are fully with other persons, particularly with those whom we love, moving from our fears to folks.

21 6 The third suggestion on finding meaningful relationships, is to move from merely belonging to really participating. This is certainly true in the church. I find people sometimes say that the church is an unfriendly place, and I generally find that it is an unfriendly person who says this. Although it is not always this way. Harvey Potthoff tells of a women in a certain church who was asked after the service if she was a stranger there, and she said, "Why, yes, I have been a stranger here for forty years." How many people try to join the church or any other group in order to achieve a leave of absence from loneliness? Here is one time during the week when you can be near and around other people, and if the church serves no other meaning than this, it is meaning enough.

22 2 Yet there is a deeper meaning than just belonging. It's involvement with other people. You see, when you move away from just belonging to something, to real involvement with other human beings, you find the strength to face the temptations in your loneliness.

The fourth and last suggestion for achieving companionship is to move away from yourself to other people. Have you heard people say that life is boring, life is monotonous, life is meaningless? All the time they are

expecting the world to run up and throw its arms around them and greet them and make them welcome. But it doesn't happen this way. The motion is in the other direction. This is the direction in which Jesus moved, out toward people, arms open, palms up, greeting. The late

-
- 23 0 Bishop Raymond Grant tells about a group of tourists who got out of a sightseeing bus at a great dam in the Pacific Northwest. Some of them went over to the railing and looked down from the great height. Others started down a stairway to see the inner workings of the hydro-electric plant. There was one man who was obviously a loner, who stayed off by himself and suddenly ran over to the railing and climbed up to jump. Some people screamed. A couple of men ran toward him. A guard ran over and tried to reach him. The man said to the guard, "If you do that I'll jump right now." Just at that point another party of tourists came. Among them were some young people. One young girl
-
- 24 1 with a wisdom and a sympathy and a feeling beyond her years walked quietly toward the man up on the railing and said, "Mister, would you like to have me hold your hand?" He thought for a moment and said, "Why, yes." He climbed carefully down and the two walked quietly away holding hands, together. Somebody, somewhere cared. Somebody moved away from himself to another human being.

John Donne said "No man is an island." That isn't quite true. We are all islands in the midst of a common sea and there are some paths we must walk alone. But Donne was right when he inspired the song:

- 25 4 No man is an island
 No man walks alone
 Each man's joy is a joy to me
 Each man's grief is my own
 No man is an island
 No man walks alone.¹¹

Or as someone else put it many years ago: "The hour is coming, indeed it has come when you will be scattered, every one to his own home, and you will leave me alone; yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me."

Let us pray: Help us, O god, to live through those dark valleys, to walk through the valley of the shadow of death, of sickness, of alienation, of misunderstanding, and to find that when we are most alone, we are grasped by a power that is not our own and thou art with us always. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

TOTAL 126 COUGHS, ETC. 5.0 AVERAGE PER MINUTE

Sermon 1: FOOTNOTES

¹Leslie Weatherhead, Key Next Door (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 30.

²John Bainbridge, Garbo (Garden City: Doubleday, 1955), p. 12.

³Rollo May, Man's Search For Himself (New York: Norton, 1953), p. 202.

⁴For the basic idea and outline of this section see Weatherhead, op. cit., pp. 30-34.

⁵May, op. cit., p. 203.

⁶Melvin E. Wheatley, Jr., A sermon entitled "Loving Enough To Leave Alone," Westwood Community United Methodist Church, May 12, 1967.

⁷Arthur Miller, "The Bored and the Violent," Harper's Magazine, 225:1350 (November 1962), 52.

⁸William Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (Garden City: Doubleday, 1957), p. 403.

⁹Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 33.

¹⁰Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Letters And Papers From Prison (New York: Macmillan, 1953), p. 95.

¹¹Joan Whitney and Alex Kramer, "No Man Is An Island" (Delaware Water Gap: Shawnee Press, 1950).

APPENDIX J

Sermon 2: HAVING AUTHORITY WORTHY OF RESPECT

Minutes	Coughs	Text:
		Matt. 7:28-29 "And when Jesus finished these sayings, the crowds were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes."
1	14	Jesus had authority all right, but that is what got him into trouble with the authorities. He had that indefinable substance that we call charisma--the ability to influence and have authority over other people. He never abused this so far as we know. He never taught disrespect for authority. As a matter of fact he was rather explicit in upholding the authority of religion. You remember he said, "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets: I have come not to abolish, but to fulfill them." (Matthew 5:17). And then concerning political authority, on one occasion he said, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." (Mark 12:17). He upheld the religious and the political authority. He led no mobs, he started no insurrection. Oh, on one occasion he went into the Temple and upturned the tables of the moneychangers. But he did it by himself. He was not inciting to violence. He was not trying to overthrow the powers that be. Yet the authorities took mob violence and used it against him. They were afraid he was breaking down people's respect for them, so the Jewish and the Roman authorities got together, incited the mob, and we can still hear them saying, "Crucify him, crucify him." (Matthew 27:22).
3	8	Here we see what is happening in our own day. It's called the breakdown for the respect for authority. I feel it as a minister. Teachers feel it. Public officials feel it and you can summarize the whole thing in this one sentence: "You don't have any right to tell me anything!" Now let's begin by accepting the fact that there really is a breakdown of respect for authority. We see it in racial vio-

lence, anti-war demonstrations, violence in the streets. As terrible as these things may be, I wonder if we haven't brought it on ourselves. As one observer has said, "Violence is as American as cherry pie."¹ If you don't believe it, watch television for one evening beginning with the 6:00 o'clock news. Violence is as American as cherry pie. We are the ones who supply the armaments to the world. We are the chief arms suppliers to most of the nations in this world. Indeed, when we capture enemy in our wars, we often find they are fighting us with our own weapons. The danger in all this is that we may over-react. We may feel that anarchy is taking over the country, and that the only answer to this is the strong man tyrant. The get tough policy. There is real danger in mob psychology.

4 8

Aldous Huxley wrote these words. He begins by quoting Jesus: "Where two or three are gathered together there am I in the midst." And he goes on to say, "In the midst of two or three hundred, the divine presence becomes more problematical. The numbers run into the thousands or tens of thousands, the likelihood of God being there in the consciousness of each individual, declines almost to the vanishing point. Herded into mobs, men and women behave as though they possessed neither reason nor free will. Crowd intoxication reduces them to a condition of anti-social irresponsibility. While in this state they well believe any nonsense that may be balled at them, will act upon command or exhortation, however senseless, mad, or criminal."² And if you don't believe it, as I said, just watch the news on television one night. I fear this kind of mob psychology. I don't want this community ruled by this or do I want any community ruled by it.

5 12

But let's see the other danger, so clear in the gospel, that you can take this same mob psychology and turn it around and use it. Aldous Huxley goes on to say: "Crowd-delirium evoked by members of the opposition to the powers that be in the name of heretical principles has every where been denounced by those in power. (For example, the June 23rd Century Plaza Peace Parade). But crowd-delirium aroused by government agents in the name of orthodoxy is

6 16 an entirely different matter. In all cases where it can be made to serve the interests of the men controlling the state or the church, you know what happens. Pilgrimages and political rallies, emotionalistic revivals and patriotic parades--these things are ethically right so long as they are our pilgrimages, our rallies, our revivals, and our parades." It's mob violence the other way. But with us it is engineering public opinion.

What I am most concerned about is that our apprehension will turn gradually into terror, and the lure of tyranny, the police state, the strong man who promises to get tough, will become irresistible.

7 10 If we want any respect for authority, we have to have authority worthy of respect. And how do you get it? Jesus seemed to have it, but in the face of the world's authority it seems so weak and namby-pamby. I am convinced that the duly constituted authorities in our country can have respect. And we can help them to have respect if we can find it for ourselves. Let me suggest that respect for authority focuses around three words--reality, responsibility, reconciliation.

I. REALITY

8 10 Respect begins with reality. And you have to start looking at things as they really are, not as you would like them to be--things as they really are from your point of view, but also to get outside of yourself and see them from the other fellow's point of view, which is difficult indeed if not impossible. Now we have a breakdown for respect for authority in our community. We find it among young people. Recently at a youth forum the young people were asked, "Why is it you don't have more respect for the police?" And one young man was courageous enough to say, "Because most of us have our first experience with the police when we are given a ticket." Think back to your own experience. What was your first encounter with a policeman? I remember mine, and I would just as

soon not tell you about it.

But let's try to see reality from our point of view. And who are we? We are citizens of a fine community, well-governed, comfortable, and middle class. We grew up with respect for authority. It was born and bred in us. I recall one day getting into the elevator in our Town Hall with my mother and the Mayor stepping into the car. I could see and feel my mother's respect. And I just picked it up. I don't think it had anything to do with the fact that he gave me a shiny new dime because I was too young to vote. There was a kind of built in respect that we felt for Mayor Lyle. We grew up with it.

9 8

Also, you and I have respect for authority for we have a lot to protect. We worked hard, we have security, we want to invest our security in a community where it will be protected. Therefore anything in our society that threatens what we have collected in the way of security becomes a threat to us personally.

Also, I dare say that never have many of us felt like rioting or looting. We have lived as law-abiding citizens most of our lives. The only killing that has been advocated in our lives was in the military service where we were taught to do it in an organized fashion. Therefore we cannot understand what it feels like to be so enraged as an underprivileged person in society so that you would want to riot and to kill. We haven't been there. We simply cannot feel inside the other person's skin. The trouble is that the get-tough policy that we advocate is get tough with the other guy. The authorities if we have a stronger policy aren't going to get tough with us. You know what it reminds me of?--the elephant that was dancing among the chickens and said, "It's every man for himself!"

10 8

The "War on Poverty" is a fighting phrase to many of us. We put bumper stickers on our cars saying, "I fight poverty. I work." But what do you do if you are part of that segment of our society that can't find a job? What if you can find a job, but you can't make enough

11 6 to keep your family? Thirty-five million Americans are classified as poor. Now what is a poor person? It is a person who lives in a family of four, husband, wife and two children, who have to live on less than \$3,000 a year in one of today's cities. Thirty-five million are in this category. Eighteen million of them are innocent children who didn't ask to be born. Many of them will never, unless things change, get out of being poverty-stricken.

12 8 Poverty also means that you can't get good medical care. I am ashamed of the fact that the United States has a higher infant mortality rate than twelve other nations in the world. We are thirteenth on the list. And whose babies die? The babies of the poor mostly. If you took the five income groups of America, the lowest fifth get about five percent of the income of this country. The top fifth get forty-five percent and most of us here today are in the top fifth. Most of us here today are in the top twenty percent.

Most maddening of all is that there is no way out. For most of the people who live in the ghetto, they will be in some sort of ghetto the rest of their lives. You do not believe it? I am sure some of you are saying that Watts isn't this bad. Don't you believe it. Just because it doesn't look like the slum of Detroit, or Newark, or Chicago, or New York City, doesn't mean that it is not a ghetto. It is deceptive to ride through Watts because the ghetto is different, but it is a ghetto nonetheless.

13 8 Here is where we begin--with reality. For the only authority that is worthy of respect is authority that is based on an understanding of things as they are seen, not just from our point of view, but from the other fellow's point of view too--reality.

II. RESPONSIBILITY

Now we are ready to move on to the second point of responsibility. Who is

-
- responsible? I don't want to let anybody off the hook who has done violence to another human being. I do not believe in violence. Our family has had enough of it, or enough close shaves with it to have any love for it. Let me recite to you what I recited some months ago. In a three month period these things happened. From my office I heard the shot that killed a policeman trying to defend against a bank robbery just a few doors away. 100 yards from our home a child molester accosted one of our children, and fortunately she had been alerted to the possibility that this sort of thing could happen and was not harmed. The third thing was that one morning when my wife returned from grocery shopping she disturbed a burglar in the middle of burglarizing our house. He dashed out the back door as she came through the front door. One afternoon our family was window-
-
- shopping on Wilshire Boulevard, and we were nearly attacked by a man who did not like the fact that one of our daughters had smiled at him. Then one day in front of our house, a car went out of control because the driver had fallen asleep at the wheel. It crashed into the back of the car of friends of ours where a small child was in the back seat and narrowly escaped with his life. All of that within a three month period to our family. Then just recently my father was accosted and beaten up by three men who tore his clothing to shreds in a frantic search for valuables. I have no love for violence. And I want all persons who commit crime caught and prosecuted.
-
- 14 2
- 15 8

Now the real question is how do you get the purveyors and practicers of violence and lack of respect for authority to see responsibility. It isn't easy. Paul said, "If a man won't work, let him not eat." (II Thessalonians 3:10). You can't do it this way.

It isn't a matter of "will," it is a matter of "can." Disadvantaged people can't help themselves no matter how much we think they can. I guess there are some exceptional cases, but even if we give them all the money in the United States budget, all manner of charity and welfare, it takes more than that in a technological society. Consider the matter of scholar-

ships at the University of California. You say, why couldn't we charge tuition and then give scholarships so that the disadvantaged could go to the university? For the simple reason that the person who grows up disadvantaged does not know how to make his way in our society through the bureaucratic red tape. He does not even know how to reach out and take the thing that is there for him to receive.

And nobody can really help anybody else in terms of telling him what to do. He has to want to change. You can give all the good advice in the world, but it is going to fall on deaf ears until the person decides he wants to be a part of society, that he wants to find an authority in it that he can respect.

And the only way that I think this is going to happen is on a one to one relationship. Relationships between human beings, rich and warm and deep. Anybody who has been dealt what he feels is a fatal blow of being born a disenfranchised person in this society is going to respond to one thing only other than force. That is the pervading understanding that another human being has faith and hope and love--in him. Relationship is what is going to make the difference.

And that is where we come in. Our responsibilities are great because we are the privileged part of this society. Remember what Jesus said: "Freely you have received, now freely give." (Matthew 10:8). We are the blessed. This Thanksgiving week we are the ones who have received more than anybody else in the whole history of civilization on this planet. Our responsibilities are enormous. We try to pass the buck. "Who was responsible for the riots last summer?" asks Robert Raines. "The President? Well, perhaps he was slow in committing troops in Detroit. Yet the very people who blame the President are the same ones who vote down the bills that he proposes to Congress that would get at the root causes of riots and violence. Other people blame the Supreme Court for decisions limiting police interrogation powers. Others blame radical Negro leaders. Others say it is an international foreign

conspiracy. Some say the police are at fault--too harsh in Newark and too gentle in Detroit. So we pass the buck looking for a scape goat and it generally ends up at the doors of Congress. There is much truth in the fact, I believe, that Congress is responsible in large part for the riots." Raines cites Newsweek magazine in its July 31 edition on what the House did this year.

19 2 They "slashed the model cities program, . . . cut off new funds for rent subsidies for the city poor, . . . pruned the federal aid to education, . . . Having thus dealt with the root causes of riots, the House . . . jammed through its own homemade remedy . . . an 'anti-riot' bill that could put Stokley Carmichael in jail, but . . . would not prevent riots." And then came Mr. Johnson's rat-control measure, and you remember the House of Representatives made fun of this bill. "Florida's James Haley teased, to loud guffaws, 'Why not just buy some cats and turn them loose on the rats?' . . . punned Virginia's Joel T. Broyhill: 'Let us vote down this rat bill rat now!' And so they did." A few weeks later they passed it only after enormous pressure. Raines concludes: "If I lived in a rat-infested ghetto, and every ghetto is rat-infested, and if my children were frightened and bitten by rats, I would be bitter that the Congress of my country did not care about my children. And I would be inclined to do something about it."⁴

20 2 Every month we spend more money firing artillery shells into Vietnamese jungles, every month we spend more money doing this than it costs for the total rat-control bill program in this country. John McCone who headed up the commission's report on the Los Angeles riots says this: "Affluent Americans are gripped more by the need to buy a vacation home, a sports car for their college-bound son and a second color television set than they are with sharing their affluence with the poor."⁵ I say this to you this morning. If we don't do it voluntarily, it will be done for us. Raines says that this is what we are doing to the poor and he puts it in terms of a movie he saw. A man was standing in front of a tank that was chest high, the tank filled with water. Another man with velvet gloves came up behind him, grabbed his head, and

21 8 pushed it under the water and held the head there with velvet gloves until the body moved no more.⁶ This is where we stand today. We are the most responsible people in this society-- you and I. The only authority worthy of respect is the kind that is based on the acceptance of responsibility for changing the injustices that you and I benefit from.

III. RECONCILIATION

22 4 Begin with reality, move to responsibility, but if you are a Christian you end up with reconciliation. Paul says we are called to a ministry of reconciliation. "God was in Christ reconciling the world, not counting our trespasses against us, and entrusting to us a message of reconciliation." (II Corinthians 5:19). Not tolerance, but forbearance. Not noblesse oblige, a white man's burden, but an I-Thou relationship. And this is where the church comes in. Reconciliation may begin in some people when they rebel against the authorities that be in the name of a higher authority. What would you call the Boston Tea Party but that? Or read the Declaration of Independence. They're filled, these documents, these events are filled with fighting words.

23 10 That's the message of the Bible. Moses rebelled against Pharaoh. Jeremiah was the first placard carrier. He disturbed the streets of Jerusalem. Amos was the first hippie and his outlandish costume upset the people of Jerusalem. Jesus ended on a cross. Paul spent a great part of his life in jail. Luther was nearly killed. John Wesley was stoned on numerous occasions for trying to establish the church and the denomination in which we worship today. Reconciliation begins with some people in some places in a rebellion against the authority in the name of a higher authority.

Remember in the lesson this morning it says "These men turned the world upside down . . ." (Acts 17:6) It was describing Christians. Is it any wonder that in the civil rights marches in this country there have been

clergymen present in a non-violent way trying to make a witness. I think that they are with Norman Thomas who said recently of the extremists of the left that they want to burn America. Mr. Thomas said he wants to wash America, not burn her.⁷ I think that the clergy of this country want to wash America with Norman Thomas. There are some things that need to be cleaned up. But let's never forget that a kind of rebellion against authority that is evil has been a part of our faith and our history. Reconciliation however today I think is a little different from what it was three or five years ago. Remember at the end of the Civil War Lincoln said, "Now is the time to bind up the nation's wounds."⁸ During the war you fought the war, but afterwards you bound up the wounds. I wonder if perhaps today we haven't moved into a new phase. The rebellion is not over, but we are moving toward a time of confession, asking for forgiveness and reconciliation.

24 4

I believe this country has the know-how and the money. You know we are spending, what is it, 25 billion dollars a year to fight in Vietnam. We can mobilize for justice, we can begin to enfranchise the people in our society, we can read, we can write to our Congressmen and our Senators, but I don't think anything is going to happen until it happens right here with us.

25 6

Therefore I want to issue a challenge to our congregation. I believe that we have the financial responsibility and the capacity to establish some sort of mission from our church to the world around us in this city and in the Los Angeles area. I can picture us underwriting at least the partial support of a person who would move into the problems of our community and show us how we can begin to be more effective. Two families from the Methodist Church in Garden Grove, California decided to rent an apartment in Watts. They shared it on alternating weekends. At first they were met with hostility and misunderstanding by people who lived in the area--"What are you doing here?" But gradually they found acceptance. And then they were able to go back to Garden Grove, California to a church just like this one and

begin to talk to people in ways they would understand about what it means to be poor, what it means not to be able to find a job, what it means to be on welfare. And there is one congregation that is just beginning to understand.

- 26 8 The only authority worthy of respect is the authority that moves beyond justice to mercy, and mercy always has suffering in it. That is what the Cross tells us.

-
- 27 6 "Burn, baby, burn." That's the cry of a minority in our society who would change this world, turn it upside down, destroy it if need be. Burn, Christian, burn, with the restraining love of Jesus Christ. Here is an answer to the lack of respect for authority in our day. As Christians we dare not let this revolution be destructive. And I think that you and I in a small way have in our hands the power to make it constructive.
-

TOTAL 214 COUGHS, ETC. 7.6 AVERAGE PER MINUTE

Sermon 2: FOOTNOTES

¹Attributed to H. Rap Brown.

²Aldous Huxley, "Crowds," a column that appeared in the Chicago Herald and Examiner (June 10, 1932), 9.

³These statistics cited by Robert Raines, "Who Is Responsible For the Riots?", Christian Advocate, XI:18 (September 1967), 9-10.

⁴Ibid., p. 9.

⁵From conversation with F. Crane, Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations.

⁶Raines, op. cit., p. 10.

⁷From a television interview.

⁸Abraham Lincoln, Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1865.

APPENDIX K

Sermon 3: BRINGING GOOD OUT OF EVIL

Minutes	Coughs	Text:
		Romans 8:28 "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose."
		On the cross Jesus cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matthew 27: 46). How could Jesus feel that God had forsaken him? Why did he dredge up from his memory this Psalm of all the Psalms, the 22nd that begins with these words, "My God, my God"?
1	6	For the very simple reason that he felt God-forsaken. And I do not know how else you could possibly feel if you had Herod and Pilate and Gaiaphas and Judas working against you. The real question here is how could God possibly permit this kind of evil? How could he let the best man who ever lived die this kind of death?
		That's the tragedy of the cross. But even deeper than this, how did God possibly manage to bring good out of such an evil thing? That's the mystery of the cross. And if you aren't as confused about the mystery of goodness as you are about the mystery of evil, then you just don't understand the situation.
2	7	That's why Christianity of all the world's religions is the most satisfying to me. I realize I was born into it, but I think that if I was looking at it dispassionately, I would see that it's the only religion that tries to come to terms with evil. Not by denying evil, but by facing it and resisting it.
		Christianity in its best form never tries to run away from evil. It speaks of overcoming evil with good. And Paul says, "In everything God works for good for those who love him" He sees, Paul does, the mystery of evil without missing the mystery of goodness too. He sees that we can confront the worst that the world has to offer and triumph over it. Now the question is "How?" I want to suggest

three things today.

I. COMING TO TERMS WITH EVIL

3 2

The first is this. We need to wake up to the fact that the only kind of religious faith that can survive in this world is the kind that comes to terms with evil. By that I mean be willing to grapple honestly with evil. So much, I think, of what happens in a church is what you see in a wrestling match on television. It is decided ahead of time who is going to win. It's something of a contest, but the outcome is pre-determined. I think of a couple driving past a church looking at the bulletin board and the announcement of the next Sunday's sermon topic. It raised the question, "Can Jesus' Way Ever Win?" The man chuckled to his wife, "Wouldn't it be a laugh if the minister said it can't?" We don't really expect any honest grappling with evil and with the world as it is in the church, and when it happens we are really surprised.

4 2

The evil that I believe both preacher and congregation should do battle with comes in two different forms. The first is the kind that is caused by our self-centeredness, that will allow us to buy a \$4,000 automobile without batting an eye or thinking once about the people in our world whom part of the money would help feed. Or it can be the war that we are involved in

5 7

now. This is also man's self-centeredness. Or it can be the exploitation of our brother, the fact that we are comfortable because we live on the labor, on the sweat and the toil of countless thousands of people. That is one kind of evil, the self-centered kind. But then there is the so-called natural evil, the kind that falls beyond our responsibility in mastering. I am thinking of earthquakes and famines, although famines in large part could be controlled. I think of the evil of the lingering illness that has struck a young mother in her early thirties, an illness that will be with her for the rest of her life. I think of a father of two teenage children who died suddenly just when he wanted to live the most and when his family needed him the most.

When this happens we find ourselves shaking our fist and asking "Why?" But you know the question "why" is not a very fruitful question because most of the time there is no answer to it. You remember Job, boils on his body, his children dead, his friends telling him to curse God and die--Job asking, "Why have these things happened to me? They are all out of proportion to anything that I could ever have done." (Job 2:7-10). And then suddenly realizing that when you have the answer to the question "why" you are God. And nobody is God. At the very most we know just a tiny bit about God. I remember Fosdick saying in one place that he had an island up in Maine. He said, I go out to

the ocean there and I step into it and I feel the water around my body, and when I dive into the waves I taste the salt. I love my island and I love the sea around it, but God is like all of the seas of the whole world. And when you plunge into the ocean in Maine you know a little something about the ocean and what you know is true and valid, but in no sense can you say you know all about the ocean."¹ Shaking our fist at the sky doesn't do any good. Asking "Why," "Why," doesn't get you anywhere. But does this mean then that we shouldn't try to understand? No, I think we have every responsibility to try to understand. Every great setback that has been dealt to death, disease, earthquake, famine, war, crime, has come through the sustained efforts that we have made to understand, to push our understanding to its

outer limits--to grapple honestly with real evil whether it is the kind we have created or the kind we cannot understand. The only honest attitude is a humility that says nobody can understand all of the whys, but a determination to go as far as we can in understanding evil.

A week ago last night, driving down from Santa Barbara in the rain, my car suddenly went out of control. It headed straight for the guard rail, bounced around, flipped into oncoming traffic and then back again headed in the wrong direction on my own side of the road. Fortunately there was no car right at that moment, and I was safe. I did not cause the rain. I was driving carefully. And then sud-

9 6 denly, out of control, helpless, thrown about. I'll tell you one thing, I am glad some highway engineer devised guard rails, and I am here this morning, probably not in a hospital somewhere, because even when there is evil and danger that we cannot understand, there is something that we can do about it. Here is where it all begins, with a determination to deal with the evil as we find it. The only kind of faith that really matters is the kind that is willing to come to terms with evil. Now that's the first thing I want to say.

II. THREE WAYS TO COME TO TERMS WITH EVIL

10 3 The second is this. There are three possible ways that you can come to terms with evil. The first is to say that if God is good, then evil isn't real. "If God is good, he is not God."² It doesn't exist. We see this, or I saw it a few years ago when Joan Winchell, a columnist of the Los Angeles Times, went to see a play called J.B. by Archibald MacLeish. It was a modern rendition of the story of Job in the Old Testament. Miss Winchell said she thought it so depressing she left after the first act. The night that we were at the theatre there was a young couples' group from another church. They went out afterwards to discuss the play. They talked about suffering, unmerited suffering, the whys and the wherefores. The pastor said, "Well, would you like to go to a play again so we can discuss it?" And they said, "Well, next time let's go to a musical comedy." Let's go to a musical comedy! You see, they are in those years where you are rearing children, and the tragedies haven't begun to descend upon you. There is a religious idea in our society, Christian Science, Science of Mind, Supernaturalism, call it whatever you will, and they say that evil is a product of evil thoughts, and that evil doesn't exist except in our own thinking, and if we can expurgate our own thoughts of evil then there is no evil. Oh, that would be neat, wouldn't it. If you could just think beautiful thoughts and get rid of everything. If you could say pain isn't

- 11 7 real, death isn't real. There is a limerick written in England about a faith-healer from the town of Deal. It is one of my favorites:

There was a faith-healer from Deal
Who said, "Although pain isn't real,
When I sit on a pin,
And it punctures my skin,
I dislike what I fancy I feel."

Certainly the notion that "If God is good, then evil is not real," does not really come to terms with the situation.

- 12 5 Now another way of dealing with evil is to say: "If evil is real, then God isn't good." That's the turn about. This is the declaration of the meaninglessness of life, that there is no plan of goodness in the world. You find it in Shakespeare: "Life is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."³ You can find it in Sartre. You can find it in the beatnik with his beat coffee and his angry poetry on his pad. It is saying, "I can't understand evil, therefore God isn't good." MacNeile Dixon in his Gifford Lectures talked about a fly that he saw one day on a masterpiece by Raphael in the Vatican Museum. Now

-
- 13 4 he said, "What could that fly possibly know about Raphael's masterpiece?" Oh, he could know something, a little about the terrain, that in some places it was rough, some places smooth, some places the pigments were bright, and other places dull. But what could he know about the meaning of the painting, the reason that it was there, what was in the mind of the artist? Never in ten thousand flies' life-times would he ever be able to figure it out.⁴ So when we are tempted to say, "If evil is real, then God is not good," let us remember, we don't know everything. We only see one little part of the whole picture.

Now the answer isn't in this direction. It is not saying that if God is good, then evil isn't real, nor saying that if evil is real, then God isn't good--it's really saying that God is not only good, he is faithful. And that is saying a lot more. It is all the difference in the world. It means that God didn't promise us an easy life, or as the Italians say, "la

dolche vita," the sweet life, the soft life. He doesn't put up any kind of shield against the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." Rather he tells us that we must take our chances with everyone else and with him, and that he will never desert us. I selected for our text Paul's claim that "We know that in everything

14 4 God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose." This isn't a pollyanna, rose-colored glass, positive-thinking outlook on the world. It is trying to say that evil is real, but for anybody who has responded to God's love, it has lost its power to defeat us. Here is one of the great mysteries, that the very things that seem to deny the goodness of God, are the ones that make his goodness most clear.

Dr. Edward Wilson was a physician on an antarctic expedition, said that pain and trouble and sorrows are either one thing or they are another. To those who love God they are love tokens from Him. To those who don't love God and don't care, they are nothing but a nuisance.

15 7 And I might add, a tragedy. It's no accident that the most popular picture after the second world war was a film called The Best Years of Our Lives. And do you know what it was about? It was about separation, war, suffering, defeat, death, betrayal. And this is the mystery, that God speaks to us sometimes most clearly out of the evil.

III. BRINGING GOOD OUT OF EVIL

Now, let me summarize what I have said so far. First, that the only religion that makes any difference is one that can come to terms with evil and wrestle with it. Second, those who grapple honestly with evil come to see that life yields up her meanings--not to those who deny that evil is real or that life is meaningless, but to those who proceed on the ground that God is faithful. Now the third thing that needs to be said is that God can bring good out of evil in our personal lives. Let me show you this in two areas of great evil--disease and death.

16 7

God can use disease for good and I am not saying this in any flippant way. Anyone here who has been sick, couldn't say that. I see about as much sickness and suffering as anybody here with the exception perhaps of the physicians. Nor am I suggesting that we should acquiesce in sickness and disease and let it go unchecked because it can be turned to good in some miraculous way by God. Disease must be fought with every scientific instrument at our disposal. But we are still a long way from conquering all disease, and the real issue is whether the person suffering from such a disease is going to be conquered by it, or is going to conquer through it. I remember in my first parish a woman in her late fifties who was suffering from an incurable disease. She did not know this; she just thought that she was sick. But her daughter knew. Finally when she did not respond to treatment, did not get better, she began to suspect that there was something seriously wrong. She pressed her daughter for an answer--"Tell me what I have. Am I going to get well?" Her daughter told her it was an incurable disease, but they still had hope. The mother went into a panic. The daughter followed her. They went from one doctor to another and the diagnosis was the same with monotonous repetition. As she deteriorated in physical health, they became even more desperate and began to seek out the quacks, the advertisements that you see in magazines. They were grasping for straws--for anything. I stood by with great sympathy. And in a final spasm of false hope this woman died. All I can say is that in ministering to that family, I came to see the terrible, final victory disease can have over the body--not only the body, but over the mind and spirit as well. This is when a disease conquers.

I can't help but contrast that with my recollection of the final illness of Senator Robert A. Taft. You will remember that he too became ill and it was a number of months before the doctor discovered that he had cancer. When he learned the truth (and they told him candidly), he was at first just as stunned as any of us would be. And then, with his amazing response of courage, he said, "All right, if there

19 14 is anything that you can learn about this disease from me, I am willing to be experimented on." And like the woman I just told you about, he did die. But in all his suffering and in his dying, he was not really conquered by disease. He conquered through it. This is one way I believe God brings good out of evil.

Now let's look at death. I am not so concerned about the person who dies, for he is out of his trouble and toil, but I am concerned about the family. And for them it can be the difference between being conquered by death or conquering through it.

20 10 Who here has not read the words of Kipling and enjoyed them? But do you realize that most of the great writing of Kipling came before the last twenty years of his life. He produced very few of the lilting songs and refrains that we are so familiar with in those last twenty years. Andre Maurois, the French critic, said that Kipling lost his son in the first World War, and ever after the gift of song was gone. Kipling became a recluse and the world was the loser. Contrast if you will a man in Baltimore whose son was killed in World War II. This man was bowed but not broken by what happened. He continued at his business affairs. He was at worship every Sunday. When his pastor, Harold Bosley, said "How can you carry on?" he said, "It isn't easy. We had planned otherwise for our son, but my work needs to be done and I must do it." You say there is no difference in these two attitudes? I think there is all the difference because the one puts health in the presence of disease and life at the center of death. It is the difference between defeat and victory, in being conquered by death and disease, or conquering through them.

21 3

Also I believe God brings ultimate good out of, what seems to us, ultimate evil. You know if I had been in Jerusalem that Good Friday, I can't possibly imagine how the Christian movement could have gone on. It just seems incredible to me. And if I had heard Jesus say, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?", and if I knew no more of the scripture than this, I would have been desolate. He was born

- into a captive nation. The country was disease ridden. There were natural calamities. Force was the only law. He was betrayed, arrested, denied, scourged, mobbed, crucified, and then deserted by his friends. And then he said,
- 22 5 "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"
 Later on in that same psalm are these words.
 Perhaps Christ mumbled them under his breath:

In thee our fathers trusted;
 they trusted, and thou didst
 deliver them
 To thee they cried, and were saved;
 in thee they trusted, and were
 not disappointed.

We are really trying to say something more than just our own personal satisfaction and security. We are trying to say that the universe was put together in such a way that out of this deed, God brought good.

- 23 3 A very popular preacher in the Middle Ages, a monk, announced one morning that he would preach on the love of God that evening in the cathedral. As the last light was coming through the stained glass windows, a large congregation gathered in the nave. When the last light had flickered out through the window, the monk went to the candelabrum by the altar, took a single candle, held it first under the wounds
-
- 24 0 in the feet on the full-sized figure on the cross, and then beside both the hands, and then by the wound in the side, and finally by the thorn-crowned brow. He didn't say a word. The people wept, for they knew they were standing in the presence of a mystery so great that no mind can measure it, and so deep that no one can fully understand. Let us pray.

Oh God, speak to all who feel forsaken and lost and afraid. Nobody knows the trouble we have, nobody but ourselves and thee. Forgive us for feeling sorry for ourselves and acquiescing in our difficulties. And enable us to come to terms with the evil around us and within us, for thou art faithful as Christ taught. Hear us for his sake. Amen.

TOTAL 146 COUGHS, ETC. 6.0 AVERAGE PER MINUTE

Sermon 3: FOOTNOTES

¹Harry Emerson Fosdick, Dear Mr. Brown (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), p. 43.

²Archibald MacLeish, J. B. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957), p. 11.

³William Shakespeare, Macbeth, Act V, Scene 5.

⁴Told by J. Wallace Hamilton, Who Goes There? (Westwood, New Jersey: Revell, 1958), p. 122.

APPENDIX L

Minutes

Coughs

Sermon 4: A PASTOR PONDERES VIETNAM

1 20

I want to speak to you today about Vietnam, but I want to speak as a pastor. Up until about a year ago like most other people I tried to avoid the problems that the war poses. Isn't it amazing how adept we are at putting out of our minds things that we don't want to think about. How many activities and amusements we can find to avoid, to avoid doing and thinking what we know must finally be dealt with. In some ways, it was as though the war was something that was happening on another planet somewhere. Then one day I received a telephone call that one of our young men had been killed. His body was being brought home, and I was to conduct the service. That's when the war really hit me. I knew then that it wouldn't go away.

2 13

It would just keep coming closer. Our young men are being drafted. Some of them are in school and not knowing what to do. I talk with some of them before they go. I talk with some of them after they have returned, and most of them do return. I conduct the marriage service for them and their brides. And I have tried to read and understand as much about this war as I possibly can.

But I come to you with great hesitancy and with a little heart flutter. I don't want to appear more knowledgeable than I am, or really more courageous than I am. I realize better than anyone else that I have no special competence to tell the government of the United States what to do. Recently in Newsweek Magazine it was pointed out that the churches and the clergy in this country are confused.¹

There is not one voice. Ministers are confused and laymen are apathetic and confused. Churchmen realize full well that President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara have access to more information than any of us individually or collectively have. The churches and their clergy are confused, but this doesn't mean that we

don't have to wrestle with the problem.

3 4 At the same time I want to express my sympathy and confidence in the President of the United States. He faces a terribly complicated problem. I have no reason to believe that he does not want to see some sort of negotiated settlement to this war. I am certain that he agonizes over the matter much more than any of us. And I believe that he has compassion. Here is a quotation from one of his speeches: "War is always the same, it is young men dying in the fulness of their promise. It is trying to kill a man you don't know well enough to hate . . . To know war is to know that there is still madness in the world."² That's our President. As a matter of fact our government has issued thirty-four peace feelers over the past three years. There have been attempts to negotiate.

4 14 Now at the same time I want to say that I have some strong convictions based, I hope, on my faith. And let me put them into these four words--conscience, reality, compassion and hope.

I. CONSCIENCE

5 8 Now in the first place, every Christian is under obligation to live and act responsibly, in keeping with his conscience. The trouble is, a lot of the time we can't get a clear reading on what our conscience is. The issue is too confusing. It is so difficult to distinguish the alternatives. It's so difficult to think in terms of billions of dollars and millions of men. And I am certain that most of us do have convictions about the war. We want it over, either by escalation or by de-escalation, but we want it over and done with. And it's about respecting our conscience in this matter that I want to speak.

A lot of people think that once you are in a war conscience is a luxury. It's a luxury that you can't indulge in any more. Now we can't agree with those people who hold that once our nation is engaged in a war, however

mistakenly, that there should be no further discussion of the rightness of anything that we do. This is too much like the Nazis in Germany. If we conclude, after careful study, that the course that we are on is wrong, we serve both the Christian Cause and our country by saying so.

6 5 Mark Twain, who was quite a cynic when it comes to human nature, once wrote something about war. He said: "The loud little handful, as usual, will shout for war and the pulpit will warily and cautiously object at first; the great big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war and will say, honestly and indignantly, it is unjust and dishonorable and there is no necessity for it. Then the little handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war and they will be applauded at first. But the other side will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. And then you will see the strange thing of speakers stoned from the platform for free speech. And now the whole nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry, shout itself hoarse, and mob any man who ventures to open his mouth. Presently, such mouths will cease to open."³

7 18 Now I just don't agree with Mark Twain. We are seeing just the exact opposite of this happening in the United States. Persons of conviction are stepping forward. I recently read this statement by Senator Charles Percy. He said: "I welcome the deep concern which the clergy is showing about the war. I met with many of them and we exchanged ideas. They were reasonable men who were anguished about the death and destruction in Vietnam which seems so senseless to many Americans. After all, if the church is not to act as a troubled conscience, who will?"⁴

Robert McAfee Brown, who is Professor of Religion at Stanford University, says that people are going to be leaving the churches these days for two reasons--first because of the stance that the church is taking about the

problems of the world, or secondly, because we are not taking any stance at all. He said that when people are suffering and dying, it isn't enough for the church to be arguing about the rearrangement of its ecclesiastical furniture. This is the time for us to speak our conscience.⁵

8 10 And when you talk about conscience it means that you have to respect not only your own conscience, but the other fellow's conscience too. We see this in our young men who are of draft age. Some are already in the service, some are in school and not certain about what they should do, some are considering conscientious objection. Now it's the position of our church officially to give counsel and encouragement and understanding to a young man in this struggle. We do not tell young men that they ought to burn their draft cards. Far from it. This is a futile kind of protest. But we want to stand by a young man as he tries to think his way through this terrifying question. What should he do? And if a young man comes to the conclusion that he should fight, I for one will stand beside him in the expression of his conscience.

9 5 Now what I am suggesting is that the most dangerous thing for us to do is to refuse to face and to express your conscience. I told you about a pilot of a Spitfire in World War II. He went into battle. It was near the close of his tour of duty. He was fatigued, he was worn out, he was sick of war, and he made up his mind what he was going to do. As the Spitfires dived toward the Jerries, he fiddled with his safety belt, he pulled back the canopy of the cockpit just a fraction of an inch. Instead of shooting at the enemy, he was going to dive right on through, turn his plane over and bail out, which he did. He got down safely. He was picked up by the French resistance and they treated him as a hero, a hero of the Battle of Britain. They feted and dined him for two days, and after two days he shot himself. I am saying to you that conscience is too valuable and precious a thing to go against.

A young woman decided to take a stand on

10 9 a public issue that would bring abuse on herself and her family. She said afterward that she was afraid and that she never really got used to the abuse. But she also said, "I felt at peace with myself. You know I would rather take a beating from the mob than from my own conscience." And that's what I mean when I say that every man is under obligation to live responsibly in keeping with his conscience.

II. REALITY

Now the second think is the obligation to perceive reality clearly. What is reality? It all depends on your perspective. What are the objectives of our country in this war? They seem to be clear enough to us. First, we want to stop the Northern armies and the Viet Cong from crushing the South Vietnam government. The second objective is to provide an opportunity for the government in the South to choose its own political and social institutions. Now this is very clear to us. We have stated it again, and again, and again. But I don't think it's this clear to the people of North Vietnam or to the Viet Cong. I am sure that it seems to them that the United States has elected itself as a kind of policeman to the rest of the world, and goes about sticking its nose into internal affairs of another country. Now I am not saying that their opinion is correct. I am simply saying that this is the way I am sure it seems to most people whom we call the enemy.

When we talk about reality, we have to understand that what is reality to us may not be reality to them. But there are certain unpleasant facts that I think both of us can face, our enemies and we ourselves.

Let me give them to you--there are four. The first is Communism. It is not the monolithic thing that we thought it was with all the Communists in the world dedicated to the same program of "take-over." There are divisions in the Communist camp, the Chinese and the Russian being the chief one. But Communism is still aggressive, and we dare not allow a military

vacuum to develop in the world. We have to impose certain limits on military aggression. There is no doubt about this in my mind. We must not underestimate the evil possibilities of Communism and take measures to correct it. And we cannot allow the victories to go to the Communists by a kind of salami technique where you slice off one portion of the world after another. If we were to pull out of all of our active engagements with Communism it would cause a great fear throughout the world. There is a long struggle with Communism ahead of all of us.

But I think it is going to be political and economic rather than military. More about this later. Now that is one factor of reality. Communism is there. It is not going to go away. We have to face it responsibly.

The second reality factor is the word "victory." Victory doesn't mean what is used to mean. We aren't going to have any kind of unconditional surrender of the enemy. Unless you are talking about nuclear war which is a kind of total victory that nobody wants. I said a moment ago, that the battle of the future is going to be in economic and political terms rather than military. There was an advertisement in a current magazine. Maybe you saw it. It is the picture of a little Fiat car and it says: "An Italian car made in Russia with American machinery." That's the future. And that is the kind of battle that we are going to see. And don't we believe that where a country is economically free, where there are opportunities for people to find their own prosperity and their own usefulness, that this has an advantage over the totalitarian state where things are dictated from above. Victory means different things today than it did twenty-five years ago.

The third thing is the cost of the war. Remember it is costing us terribly, but it is costing the enemy terribly too. Do you realize that out of every dollar of our Federal taxes 75¢ goes to pay for past, present, and future wars--75¢ out of every dollar. We find ourselves in the position of deficit financing, chiefly because of our military expenditures. You have heard it said by Station KRLA that for the amount of money that we are spending in the

- 14 5 war in Vietnam we could give every person in that country an education, a farm, and the machinery to run it, instead of trying to blow him up. But of course this is fanciful. It's an oversimplification. The real question is whether a nation like ours as wealthy as we are, can continue the kind of policing action without neglecting the other high priority policy matters in this country, like the war on poverty. That's cost.
-

- And the fourth reality factor is world opinion. Our Bishop, Gerald Kennedy, just returned from a tour around the world, and he said this: "The world is less and less convinced of our professed aims and goals in Vietnam." In other words, the world generally disagrees with us. They do not really want us to pull out of Vietnam, but what they are saying is, they do not agree with the way that we are pursuing our policy there. That's a reality factor too.
- 15 8 And we may not like these reality factors about Communism, and victory, and cost, and world opinion, but whatever we think as Christians, we have to keep them in the front of our minds. That's the second thing.

III. COMPASSION

- Now the third is compassion. Every Christian is under obligation to keep sensitized to suffering no matter whose suffering it happens to be. Now that isn't easy in war time.
-
- 16 9 We hear a report on radio that 240 Americans are killed and we wince. And in the same broadcast we hear that 2400 of the enemy were killed, and we feel relieved. Ten times as many, and we are glad. War does something to us. It dehumanizes us and it desensitizes us. You can't put your compassion in escrow for the duration. One United States pilot, returning from a bombing mission, was describing the damage that he inflicted. When a reporter asked him how many civilians he had killed, he said, "Who the hell knows?" An Australian soldier described a particular ambush and said it was "like shooting ducks in a pond." You see under the pressure of war our compassion suffers.
-

-
- 17 6 I have talked with men from the armed forces who have killed in this war, in a "shoot-first-ask-questions-later" situation. And I do not judge them. I would probably do the same thing in their circumstances. And they have been living with their memories. I remember one young man came here to be married. He said that he was driving down the freeway and saw the flashing light of an emergency vehicle, and instinctively slumped down behind the driving side of the car because he thought it was the burst of fire from somebody's weapon. Here he was back in this country, driving to his wedding, and still living with his memories. I think that there are many young men who are like a certain pilot who reported in the November, 1966 issue of Flying Magazine that as he looked down on his assigned target in Vietnam, he reported by radio to his base that all he could see in this little village in the jungle was women and children and that there must be some mistake. But he was ordered to hit the village just the same. He said he dropped his bombs, but he admitted that he was very careful to see that they fell in an open field. Compassion isn't blotted out during war. The man in the armed service--
- 18 4 I think I can understand his feeling. But the feeling I have difficulty with is mine here at home and the other people around me who want this war over with, but we want it because we are upset that we aren't more successful. It isn't out of a deep compassion or a trying to heal broken relationships--it is the lack of success and the loss of prosperity and the fact that we may have a ten per cent surcharge on our income tax, or that "thank God, our son isn't there." This is not compassion.
-

- 19 12 And deep down I think most of us are made of finer stuff. After World War II one of our Methodist Chaplains was sent to Germany. He took his family with him. While they were there one of his two boys was tragically killed in an accident. They wanted to send his body back to the states and they had to fill out a lot of papers and answer the usual kind of questions. One of the saddest questions was this inquiry: "What is the value of your shipment?" What is the value of a human life? Does it vary for

Americans and for Vietnamese? Does a peasant mother in a little jungle village suffer any less when her child is killed than an American mother? All you have to do is to ask the question to know the answer. The Christian answer is not to subdue your compassion, but give it expression in every way that is open to you.

IV. HOPE

20 8 The last thing that the Christian is under obligation to do is to consult his hopes rather than his fears. That is the meaning of advent. "The people who have walked in darkness have seen a great light." (Matthew 4:16). Naturally there is danger that Vietnam will be escalated into World War III, but this morning thank God it hasn't happened yet. Let's be hopeful. Let's look at the half-full glass of water rather than the half-empty glass. Let's see the positive and consult our hopes.

And I sense a very hopeful thing happening in the United States today. I sense a new consensus of opinion. As widely as I have been able to read I have discovered that there is a new coalition of ideas about bringing this war to a successful conclusion. Those whose position I am relatively familiar with are General James Gavin, Senator George McGovern, Theodore Sorenson, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Ex-Ambassador Edwin Reishhauer, and Senator Charles Percy. In general these men express my own convictions. And they are saying these three things. First, stop the escalation of the war; second, hold the cities and the coastal areas; and third, shift the battle from the military to the economic and political spheres. Let's look at each of these briefly.

21 6 As far as stopping the escalation of the war is concerned, this means stopping the bombing and the jungle warfare, but it does not mean withdrawal. There is no doubt that President Johnson is right when he says that North Vietnam will have little incentive to sit down at the peace table if it holds the mistaken idea that public opinion will force us to withdraw from

Vietnam. Withdrawal would cause, in Mr. Reischauer's words, "a massive psychological tremor throughout all Asia." Our presence there is the one bulwark against the expansionist aims of the Communists. Stopping the escalation of the war, particularly the bombing, is not the same thing as withdrawal.

22 3 Now the second point, is holding the cities and the coastal areas in what General Gavin has called the enclave concept. This is probably all we are ever going to be able to hold in South Vietnam. We may control a village in the daytime, but when we pull out the Viet Cong are back in at night. The countryside has largely belonged to the Viet Cong for a number of years. As soon as we pull out they will be back, regardless of who wins the war. Limiting our military commitments, objectives, investments, and assaults, while consolidating our position in the most populous areas of the South, will cost fewer lives, less money, no territory, and no "face," and enable us to wait out the changes in the Communist world that will make real negotiation possible.

23 5 Now the third point is that of waiting and shifting the battle from military to economic and political areas. This is where the creative alternatives for Americans are. Wherever we have been given an opportunity to move in--take for example at the end of World War II--we moved in with all of our ingenuity and all of our hope, and we have in a large sense, restored Europe, restored Japan to something that they have never known before. I think that we have to move more toward the United Nations because I am convinced of this--there is no hope in this world any more for the fellow who says "I" or "my." But there is only hope when we say "we" and "our." There are some people who say this: that trying to teach people to say "our" and "we" instead of saying "I" and "my" is like trying to teach a gorilla to sit at a table and use a knife and fork. Now let me point out to you, that the bees and the ants build colonies, the birds flock and the wolves hunt in packs. But the solitary ichthyosaurus, the giant dinosaur of the primeval slime perished. The birds and the bees and the ants have

survived. And if this world is not to be taken over again by the insects, we had better learn how to say "we" and "our" too.

- 24 8 Last week end I received another phone call about conducting a funeral service for a man killed in Vietnam--22 years of age, in the middle of his college career. He went to Vietnam with premonitions of death. He wrote verse and I read this one at the funeral. It is called "Epitath of a Soldier" written in January of this year. He was married in August and went immediately to Vietnam and was killed in November:

The departed always seem to hold honor to their dreams; they never look behind for fear they will return. They smile and act gay, just hoping for the day, when they will get the chance to renew their old romance.

- 25 8 With sorrow and pride, the fears they hide from their loved ones waving goodbye, without looking back he knows the fact that he is too young to die. To places that are strange, he is now out of range from the smiles he wants to be near. But orders and shouts are just about all that he can hear.

With his gun as a tool he is a common fool to think he will make people see that this world's a place for every race, to be held in equality . . . so on he goes, fighting his foes, the endless battle still in sight. And as it will, he paid the bill for what it cost to be right. Now his friends look down with a mournful frown, thinking that war must cease. But as they file away they silently pray, "May his soul rest in peace."

- 26 10 That's sad, terribly sad. We must not lose any of the sadness, but we must not refuse to consult our hopes as well.

The year 1809 was not unlike the year 1967. It was one of the most discouraging years in Europe's history. Napoleon was dominant just the way Hitler was twenty-five years

ago. I suspect that those who lived then said that the year 1809 was the worst year of their lives. But think of what was going on in the year 1809 that was no news at all. It was the year that Charles Darwin was born, and Alfred Lord Tennyson, Edgar Allen Poe, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Cyrus McCormick, the inventor of the harvester, and the composer, Mendelssohn. I tell you this morning the world is not hopeless. Young men on both sides are dying, and we must end it as quickly as we can. But we must not stop realizing that this day somewhere as in Bethlehem a long time ago, there may be another Darwin being born, or another Holmes, or another Poe, or another Tennyson, or another Mendelssohn. Here is the message of advent--"the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light." Let us live in the light.

Let us pray--O God, our Father, the problems are too big for us. We haven't the mind or the physique to master them. Unless we be overwhelmed by our fears and fail to find our hopes, speak to us again the message of Christmas time, of a baby born in a far-off place in a stable, who lived and died at thirty-three and yet lives still and brings us hope. In the name of the Prince of Peace, we pray. Amen.

TOTAL 237 COUGHS, ETC. 8.4 AVERAGE PER MINUTE

Sermon 4: FOOTNOTES

¹Newsweek (July 10, 1967), 81.

²Lyndon B. Johnson, "State of the Union Message," January, 1966.

³Mark Twain, The Mysterious Stranger (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1916), pp. 128, 129.

⁴Charles H. Percy, The Inter-Church News (May 1967).

⁵From an interview on the NBC-TV Frontiers of Faith program, October 15, 1967.

⁶For a discussion of this general point of view see Edwin O. Reischauer, Beyond Vietnam: The United States and Asia (New York: Knopf, 1967).

⁷T. Enriquez, "Epitaph of a Soldier," January 19, 1967.

98875

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.